

The COMMUNIST REVIEW

THE COMMUNIST PARTY OF GREAT BRITAIN
16, King Street, Covent Garden, W.C.2

Number 4

Vol. 2

February, 1922

CONTENTS

Review of the Month	Russian Women at Work
Communism and an International Language	By Henrietta Roland Holst
By Mark Starr	The International of Money Bags
On Leading the Masses	By J. T. Walton Newbold
By J. T. Murphy	Book Reviews
Communism or Reformism Which?	International Review
By Maurice H. Dobb	

Review of the Month

Legacies from the Past

ONE of the most important events in French political circles, during the past few weeks, was the conference of the Communist Party at Marseilles. The press made much fuss over the clash of personalities at the Conference. We must remember that this was the first Congress of the new party. To bring together thousands of people who had previously belonged to different, and in many instances rival, Socialist and Labour groups and to weld them into one solidified and unanimous mass is not a simple affair. The antagonism of years cannot be healed in a few months. It is difficult, even for revolutionists, to forget the past. Remnants of the psychology of the old movements; shreds of the old tactical methods and traditions of the mentality of the old orthodox socialist parties, are bound to be carried over into the new organisation. These manifesting themselves in the clash of wills during a congress lead to a clash of high-spirited and enthusiastic personalities.

Each one of the recently organised Communist Parties is faced with this problem of trying to get their active members to remember 1922 and *not* 1908. Much of the blame is, no doubt, due to the long years spent, by many of the most zealous comrades, in the old

doctrinaire parties during the periods of the theoretical stage of the revolutionary movement. Before the war the one thing towards which every Socialist leader aspired was a slavish devotion to consistency. If it could be shown that he had deviated one iota from something he had said forty years previously, great was the joy of his opponents. We are now beginning to realise, since the Communist International came into being, that in the old theoretical days the movement was conducted, not according to the laws of class warfare, but in accordance with the best traditions of a debating club. First, there was the Principle. This was held so sacred that any action in keeping with the common mass tended to besmirch it. Thus, the consistency demanded by the principle made common action with the masses almost impossible. The demand for logical adherence to an abstract formula was a splendid exercise for academic theorising, but was not worth a tinker's curse when it prevented participation in any ordinary struggle of the ordinary workers for some ordinary concrete demand.

It is easy to comprehend the psychology of the doctrinaire socialists. They sit and wrangle over theories and principles until they imagine that the fight over these things is the only fight that matters. In such an atmosphere one can be logical and consistent because one only bumps up against ideas and propositions. When, however, the struggle is carried out into the streets, into the realm of reality, when concrete problems are tackled it is found that these cannot be overcome by frontal attack, but may have to be undermined or out-flanked. When the struggle is no longer a problem in logic, but is one of overcoming working class prejudices and the armed hate of the ruling proprietary interests, then success may only be possible by retreating in order to advance, or by manoeuvring for a victory. The theoretician tends to think in straight lines. But an army, in actual conflict with the enemy, seldom marches forward in a straight line.

Thus, the formation of the Communist International with its fighting tactics, meant a break with the past.

The Function of the Theses

AN examination of the newly-formed Communist Parties will show that internal personal struggles are taking place, particularly in those countries where the old Socialist parties were long established and therefore deeply rooted. The conditions created by the war, the Russian revolution, and the decadence of capitalism, were so pregnant with revolutionary possibilities that new tactics and policies were necessary for the working class movement. The ignominious breakdown of the Second International rallied every fighting socialist to the Third International. This, however, did not, automatically, wipe out the influence and modes of thinking instilled into the minds of the new recruits to Communism, who had spent many, many, years in the old movement. The Communist International had carefully thought over this matter. It did its utmost to prevent the reaction against the Second International becoming a general stampede into the ranks of the new International. The Wallheads and Longuets who sneer at the Communist International because it did not "capture" the German Independents, the French Socialist Party, and the Italian

Socialist Party seem to forget their other sneer against the "dictatorship" of the 21 points. Had the Communist International not insisted upon the 21 points; had it organised itself upon an "all inclusive" basis, it could have easily captured every large Socialist group in Europe. With unerring foresight it made entrance into the Communist International conditional upon the acceptance of its 21 conditions and a series of carefully worded Theses, which explicitly outlined the revolutionary obligations of every party and of every individual, who desired to join. The Communist International is only now beginning to weld its forces into a disciplined army. It clearly foresaw that only chaos would result were it to set out to build up a new world-wide movement out of all the elements that composed the cowardly and vacillating Second International. The Theses and the 21 points were not drawn up for the sake of providing academic discussions; these were specially prepared to exclude moderate reformers and inactive doctrinaires. In a word, the Theses were a guide to revolutionary action based upon new tactics, in keeping with new conditions. The Theses marked the beginning of the transition in the revolutionary movement from theory to practice, from doctrine to action. Small wonder their publication set up a howl in the ranks of the doctrinaire purists on the extreme left, and in the camp of the moderate reformers on the extreme right. These were both alarmed. The former were afraid of action that might sully their fragile doctrines; the latter were indignant because all activity had to be directed towards a revolutionary goal.

Despite all the precautions adopted by the Communist International, it was impossible to bring together the new movement and to give, mechanically, all the adherents the new outlook. It is the simplest thing in the world to plan the machinery and organisation necessary for a movement to conduct the class struggle to lead the masses against capitalism. But it is an entirely different thing to fill up such a movement with individuals, many of whom gleaned all their revolutionary experiences in the old social democratic parties. It was not without reason that Marx warned us that the Past clings, like an Alps, to the brain of the Present. The clash of wills at present to be seen in some of the Communist Parties is simply the psychological struggle between the past and the present, between the old and the new, working itself out. And it is in Germany, France and Italy, where the old social democratic parties dominated the minds of the revolutionary movement for a very long period, that the break with the past is so difficult, and where, therefore, the crisis is most acute. This psychological problem is not peculiar to the newly-founded Communist Parties; it is true of every new beginning in history. It marks the end of an epoch and the dawn of a new period.

Truth and the Famine

WHEN the first impact of the seriousness of the Russian famine struck this country, the majority of the daily papers began a most execrable attack on the Soviet Government. We, of course, expected nothing else. There were, however, one or two shining examples, because the *Daily Herald* and the *Manchester Guardian* showed that the Bolsheviks, with all

their faults, were unable to control the weather in Russia. While the capitalist press was doing its utmost to prejudice the Soviet Government in the eyes of the masses, our flabby contemporary, the *Labour Leader*, had, with characteristic venom, to squirt some poison at the hapless Russian republic. Our readers may remember that we quoted in the September REVIEW the following excerpt from the I.L.P. organ:—

But even if the Russian experiment had been as successful for Russia as it has been, in the main, disastrous . . .” etc.—
 (“*Labour Leader*,” Aug. 18th, 1921.)

We did not quote that passage because we desired to popularise the I.L.P. journal as a white guard publication. We put it on record so that when the story of the Russian famine was written, and when history gave its impartial judgment upon that catastrophe, we could refer to what the *Labour Leader* said about the Soviet Government at the most critical moment of its existence. History has not yet delivered its impartial verdict upon the causes of the famine, nor upon the relation of the Soviet Government to that tragic affair. But an American Commission, organised by a capitalist State and manned by anti-communists, has published its evidence after investigating into the causes of the famine in Southern Russia. What does it say? In case we may be charged with stressing the evidence in favour of the Russian Communists, let us quote it, as served up by the *Manchester Guardian* (Jan. 13th, 1922), in one of its leading articles:—

Accounting for the Russian Famine

In August last an American Commission went on a journey of investigation into famine conditions in Southern Russia. The report of its inquiries has just been published. There are the old tragic stories of babies fed on melon rinds, of bread made from the bark of trees, of the whole ghastly burden of misery which has fallen on a hapless people. Every trustworthy confirmation of the extent of this calamity is of value in a world that is hard to convince, but the most interesting part of the report deals with the actual causes of the famine. It shows how the past seven years have battered at the structure of sturdy life which the Russian peasants had built up. All through the European War they had to strain their resources to provide horses, foodstuffs, and men for military needs, and in 1917 the opening of the economic blockade cut them off from the possibility of replacing their material losses. Since then the Volga country has suffered under the force of political ambitions. In 1918 the States of Samara and Ufa were the battlegrounds of the Czecho-Slovaks. The city of Samara was partially sacked, and hundreds of farms were destroyed. In 1919 the army of Admiral Koltchak passed over the same ground, and, farther south, Denikin's troops lived on the grain that the people had grown and seized their horses. The men were pressed into the service of whatever army happened to be in occupation, and their fruitful fields were threaded with barbed wire entanglements. With peace in Russia came the droughts of 1920 and 1921. From an average of 106 millimetres in three months the rainfall in the State of Samara dropped to seven millimetres for the same period last spring. Those who had survived the ravages of war died in thousands of pestilence and famine. The American Commission has no fault to find with the handling of the situation by the Soviet Government, and only praise for the courage and industry of the peasants. They are the victims, these peasants, of a cruel fate and of ruthless, ill-considered ambition.

Now, stick a pin in there for a moment, as old Daniel De Leon used to say. In the August COMMUNIST REVIEW we published a series of photos showing the havoc caused by the White Armies, which destroyed the most important railway bridges in Southern Russia, and which paralysed the whole transport system of that part of the country. Every point which we have made in these pages regarding the famine has been verified by the report of the American Commission.

Skilful Strategy

THE real meaning of Black Friday may now be seen in the weakened condition of trade unionism, and in the awful apathy of the masses. Two years ago the trade unions were powerful organisations. Hundreds of thousands of discharged soldiers, after four years of hell and disillusionment, rallied to the banner of industrial Labourism in order to get a lead against the imperialist employers who used the war to transmute the blood of soldiers into fat bank deposits. These workers did not get a lead from the men who control the Labour forces of this country. The trade union leaders are wonderfully audacious in their attacks upon the enemies of the British imperialists, but when it comes to leading the masses against the profiteers they are as timid as any I.L.P.er suffering from the blight of social pacificism.

The employers have played a brilliant and cunning game during the past two or three years. The leadership of the propertied interests, in their campaign against the masses, has been superb. They knew when to concede and where to retreat; they knew when to advance and when to sweep forward to victory. Two or three years ago they were faced with an enthusiastic and determined body of trade unionists. Realising the temper of the masses, the employers seemed pained at the talk of strikes and class conflicts. They pleaded for more humane methods of adjusting the little differences that crop up between Capital and Labour. They spoke in sweet, dulcet tones regarding the virtues of reconciliation and the glories of Sankey Commissions. They were as mild and charming in their plea for ending all disputes by gentler means, than the intervention of industrial force, that they looked like followers of Mr. MacDonald and Mr. Snowden. It was the era of Sankey Commissions and reports. It was the period when the social pacifists proudly claimed that it was far better to *argue* with the capitalists than to *fight* them. "Behold," cried the sentimental Labourists, "see how we have out-argued the mine-owners; are not all the arguments on our side?" And everybody had to admit that the capitalists had put up a very poor case. The argumentative ability of the propertied interests was so poor that a few of the ambitious young Labour leaders began to fancy their chance as lawyers.

But, let us repeat. Neither the mine-owners' case, nor the case for capitalism generally, rests upon arguments. The thing that causes strife between Capital and Labour is not a dispute upon some point in logic. It is a conflict of *interests*; it is a clash of class *power*. The Sankey Commission, and all the other commissions, merely indicate that the propertied interests were willing to *argue*

because, at that time, it was unsafe for them to *fight*! These commissions and reports demonstrate that while the capitalists retreated the stupid leaders of the Labour movement did not advance. The fact that the struggle was postponed and that commissions were staged instead shows that the real initiative rested with the employers even though they were carrying out a retreating movement. They retired according to plan. They fell back to consolidate their forces in order to advance in mass formation. While the labour leaders and other I.L.P.-minded persons were flushed with the success of their dialectical duel with the mine-owners, the propertied interests were preparing themselves for the first favourable chance to attack the masses.

Courageous Capital

THE attack began about twelve months ago. The General Headquarters Staff of the employing class, the Federation of British Industries, was not made up of weaklings like the J. H. Thomas type. Capitalism has many faults, but it has the instinctive virtue of choosing, as its leaders, men of courage and ability, whose unflinching fidelity to their class and its interests is above suspicion and beyond cavil. When people like Clynes and MacDonald charge the leaders of capitalism with breaking their word, violating their agreements, and showing that they lack both conscience and honour, it only serves to show how much the propertied interests can depend upon their leaders. These men are not afraid. They leave empty baubles such as constitutionalism, democracy, and parliamentary government to the I.L.P., to Clynes, and to J. H. Thomas. The leaders of Capitalism, when it suits their purpose, can press the class struggle, during a strike, to the point of civil war. Under various guises they organise White Guards and arm them for deeds of violence. During a war they are prepared to use any military crisis to hold up supplies in order to squeeze the uttermost farthing out of a government that deported workers for demanding increased wages. To meet such gallant and fearless defenders of property requires something a little heavier than the rhetorical pathos of Snowden's "Christ that it is to be."

When the leaders of capitalism realised last year that the trade unions were manned at the top by people who were afraid to lead a fight, then they launched their attack. Did the mine-owners, or the other industrial magnates, propose a further Sankey Commission? No! They began the offensive by a lock-out. They knew that the heads of the Triple Alliance were weak lathes painted to look like steel bands. They smashed union after union down on to its knees. The brilliant labourists who had been so splendid at talking during the Sankey Commission were shown to be knaves and cowards when deeds and not gab became the test of serving the working class. What else but rout could be expected? One of the commanders of Labour's army was able to boast of the many honours he had received from the hands of the enemy. And at the critical moment, at a time when the enemy's ranks were wavering, he refused to permit the willing soldiers to advance. Small wonder he was called a traitor. The almost unbelievable thing was that he

insisted upon the leaders in the enemy's camp organising a court-martial to uphold his honour!

A Communist Duty

THE crushing defeat of the masses, the repeated monotony of disasters, the knowledge that the leaders were capable of everything and anything except courage, has resulted in an alarming spread of despondency and apathy. Hundreds of thousands of men have left the trade union movement. The unions are on the verge of bankruptcy and the leaders are frantic because the funds, and consequently their wages, are in danger. Here and there, a leader or two are doing magnificent work to undo the disasters of last year. But the leaders in general are only able to survey the wreck, and have neither a policy nor ideas. It is in such moments of despair, when everything seems lost, that the indomitable courage and well-poised optimism of the Communist makes itself felt. The Communists are only happy when confronted with big and seemingly insuperable tasks. Difficulties and problems inspire us and only serve to stimulate our determination. Therefore we call upon our members to do everything humanly possible to prevent the trade union weapon from being torn out of the hand of the masses. Wherever possible our members must help to retain possession of the only reliable instrument of the class-war. If the Communists set about this task in a proper manner the instrument can be made a thousand times more effective if sharpened up and properly wielded. Wherever the funds of the union are so low that the tasks of organisation, reconstruction and administration cannot be carried on, the Communist must volunteer to do whatever he can without payment. Just as his work for the Party is a voluntary tribute, so must the same spirit be carried into the unions. As the unions emerge from their present crisis, in the measure that they have been restored by the untiring energy of the Communists, so in the same measure the strands of fighting Communism will be entwined in their warp and woof. By such deeds do the Communists gain the respect of the masses; and it is the first step towards destroying the power of the old officials and rallying the workers under the leadership of Communism.

W. P.

THE COMMUNIST REVIEW can be sent to any reader direct from this office at the prepaid, postpaid, rate of 3/9 per 6 months or 7/- per year.

Terms for quantities: 13 for 5/3 post paid, sale or return; monthly account.

Order a trial supply now for sale in your trade union branch or workshop.

All communications to:

Circulation Manager,
THE COMMUNIST REVIEW,
 16, King Street, Covent Garden, W.C.

Communism and an International Language

By MARK STARR

THE backwardness of Englishmen in the acquirement and use of foreign languages is well known. Centuries of island insularity, coupled with British economic world dominance, which brought language dominance in its train, made the English tongue the only one that Britons in general cared to know. Even now some of our comrades think that Uncle Sam will carry on where John Bull left off, and that English will become the world language. But even the British Association for the Advancement of Science decided, recently, that English or any other national tongue would be too likely to excite national jealousies to make its success possible. In view of the Revolution in Russia, and the awakening of Asia, this opinion will arouse no dissent—least of all in the ranks of Communists.

Attempts to remove language barriers can be traced back in England to that of Urquhart in 1653, while earlier Descartes and Leibnitz devoted some thought to the problem. But these attempts were in the direction of an *a priori* or philosophical universal language, while the recent projects take as their basis the material furnished by the great languages of Europe. It is easy to recognise that only capitalism produced the objective conditions which made the practical application of the idea possible. When Latin was the common language among the scholars of medieval Europe, it could hardly be said to be an international or universal language, because nations had no existence in the modern sense and Latin was merely the monopoly of the cultured few. Needless to say the solution which has stood the test and triumphed over ridicule, and is breaking down the barriers of apathy and opposition and winning acceptance in every land, did not fall from heaven. The author of Esperanto, Dr. L. Zamenhof, saw in his native town, Bialystok, in the sixties of the last century, the evil resulting from the language differences of the four races living there. Being a keen student of language after years of study and many attempts, he took from each language not only the roots for the construction of the words, but also the best features of the grammars. Thus resulted the ease of acquirement and the wonderful simplicity of the grammar with its sixteen rules without exceptions.

But the most splendid effort of the most brilliant of linguists, though he might be imbued with the loftiest idealism, would not secure the adoption of an international language if economic forces were not at work creating the conditions favourable to its growth. Modern capitalism does this in several ways.

- (a) By the introduction of an uniform system of education within each country which lessens the effects of local dialects and gives to the written word a fixed form.

- (b) By the advancement of the technique of transport and the facilities of communication within and without each nation which tends to annihilate the former barriers of distance.
- (c) By increasing international trade relations. This is at first the cause of (b), but that factor reacts in turn.

Here, then, are the conditions which make an international language no longer a Utopian proposal. To say that economic supremacy will decide which language will triumph is to fall into the "deadening fatalism" which our opponents so love to pass off as Marxism. As well say that man need not have invented the steam engine, but left it to evolve itself. That the Comintern does not share this error is proved by the fact that at the last Congress it set up a commission to enquire into the practical possibility of an international language and how best the Third International could put it into use. Our comrades of the ESKI (Esperantist section of the Communist International) will have an easy task to prove that Esperanto fills the bill, and from every point of view answers to the demands that Communists are likely to make upon an International language. Unfortunately the previous decision of Soviet Russia itself to make Esperanto a compulsory subject in the schools has never been fully put into operation because of lack of teaching facilities due to the Whites, although many teachers and much financial help have been officially provided. (Let me say in passing that Ido, the only language with any pretensions of being a rival to Esperanto, buys its very dubious "improvements" at too great a cost in complication. While it appears easy to read, it is most certainly more difficult to write, speak, or understand when spoken. The super-signs in Esperanto—one practical objection of the Idists—can easily be procured from type-makers or be placed upon the type-writer, and they are the means by which the perfect alphabet of Esperanto exists. One is almost inclined to think that Lord Northcliffe, in writing a foreword to the primer of Ido, did so, not so much in the hope of advancing any one particular international language, as of discrediting Esperanto—the progress of which seems to him inimical to his Imperialist hopes.)

In the past Esperanto has been chiefly an interesting hobby for linguists, travellers and for stamp and other type of collectors, although there has always been a certain amount of "humanism" in its supporters. These "humanists" believed that if men only understood each other then universal peace would result. That phase is passing. The business world, Chambers of Commerce, Scientific Associations, the League of Nations and other bodies are beginning to use and enquire into it. The International Labour Office has issued several leaflets in Esperanto. And while the success of Esperanto on neutral grounds has never been so great as now, wherever the workers are sufficiently strong they organise themselves separately and regard Esperanto as a weapon in the class struggle (e.g., Paris has its own revolutionary Esperanto classes, and is the seat of the Sennacieca Asocio Tutmonda, and in Germany there exists the G.L.E.A.). For reasons of efficiency the language question is of vital importance to the international

working-class movement. If we want effective organisation we must have a common language. The time, energy and clearness lost in translation at Congresses are very obvious. Think how the literature of the movement would be enriched if each book by a single translation, or written originally in the international tongue, would be available at once to every speaking section of the working-class. The "neutral" Esperantists already have a weekly newspaper in Esp. (*Esperanto Triumfonta*, published in Cologne.) Why should not Communists follow suit? The pictures that Keynes gave us of the Supreme Council with only Clemenceau independent of interpreters must not be duplicated by anything in the Third International.

Granted that English stands a greater chance of adoption than French, German or Russian, this solution of the difficulty, even if it were technically possible, would not be the best way out. Why should we make others learn our language? Why not let each nation come half way to a neutral language and neither make the other stutter in a foreign tongue? After its simplicity, the neutrality of Esperanto is its greatest advantage. The result is that when Esperanto is used at International gatherings it is difficult to tell the nationality of the speaker; the experience of freely discoursing thus with comrades of other lands is an experience never to be forgotten. Apart from these considerations the adoption of English is impossible for technical reasons. Consider our spelling—the dead letters and irregular pronunciation—from the point of view of a foreigner who would need years of laborious effort to become proficient. The experts tell us that "our imperfect alphabet of 23 effective letters (c, q and x have no value of their own) have to represent about forty sounds. Compare this with the alphabet of Esperanto, in which each of the 28 letters has its one particular sound." Spelling and pronunciation are never in conflict.

Ease of acquirement in Esperanto is secured by the fact that its grammar is the simplest imaginable. English suffers from its numerous irregularities. Esperanto has no "irregular" verbs, but by means of twelve unchanging endings the expression of every shade of time is attained. Then there is the system of word building, which by the use of unalterable prefixes and suffixes enables a dozen or more words to be constructed from one root. The roots themselves are taken from existing languages and all words already international, e.g., hotel, telegram, etc., are readily absorbed. A fairly well read person would recognise either by sight or sound seventy-five per cent. of the words used.

The practical successes of Esperanto are too great to be given here. After a debate in the Finnish Parliament, 25,000 marks were voted in aid of the Esperanto Society of Finland. Its introduction into the schools was favoured and is being further investigated by the League of Nations. The Chamber of Commerce of Paris, with those of other French towns, favours it. It is already being taught in day schools in Britain at Eccles, Keithley, Barry, Leeds, Rutherglen and Worcester and elsewhere. [Incidentally in these schools it has been found to greatly improve the English of the students and helps as an introduction to other languages.] Abroad

it is making still faster progress. It is being taught in day schools in twenty towns in Germany; and the Canton of Geneva has introduced it into its schools; in Bulgaria twenty-nine Real-gymnasias have Esperanto classes. These successes are quoted merely to show that we are not endeavouring to interest Communists in a new fad which has not stood the test of experience. Our Party is out to achieve an international aim for which an international consciousness is necessary. The matter cannot be left merely to party leaders, to polyglots, linguists, or to Conferences. The rank and file must come in. The classes already started in our movement must be increased. Here is scope for practical activity. The Communist Youth Movement can here not only talk about internationalism and indulge in flag-wagging, but help to prepare the way for direct international contact. Why not an ESKI section in Great Britain? Cannot we in England contribute something to the culture of the future?

The herd group had its inarticulate cries which, with man, grew later into articulate speech. By language thought was transmitted from man to man and from age to age, and a great chasm in due time divided man from the beast. Again the conditions are ripe for another leap—man's horizon is again to be widened by increasing his means of understanding. We need and shall need the weapon of an auxiliary language in the class struggle.

Pen Pictures of Russia

By JOHN S. CLARKE
(*Editor of "The Worker"*)

The story of Red Russia told in 382 pages. There is nothing so thrilling as real History. This record of the daring deeds of the dauntless revolutionaries of Russia holds the interest of the reader from cover to cover. It is more than a story, it is an epic.

There are forty-two illustrations.

The book is bound in cloth and is sold at
4/6 net. Postage 4d. extra

Order Your Copy To-day

COMMUNIST PARTY, 16, KING STREET
— COVENT GARDEN, LONDON, W.C.2 —

On Leading the Masses

By J. T. MURPHY

WHILST the capitalists of this country are wondering whether they have reached the rock bottom of the trade depression, the revolutionaries are wondering how far off the workers are from the rock bottom of their despondency. Since Black Friday the workers have been beaten time after time, and still they retreat. Only the unemployed, and a few others, have shown fight, and these also have been so heavily defeated that despondency has seized them too. Practically every union in the country is rapidly losing its membership. All have large numbers of unemployed members, and all are swiftly moving towards bankruptcy. The union leaders have made no attempt to stem the tide of retreat. The employers have got them on the run.

This state of affairs is appalling. It is of interest and importance to observe the forms of reaction to these conditions, both among reformists and revolutionaries. The former have turned to Parliamentarism as the only hope. Even the special Conference of the Labour Party and the Trade Union Congress, called to deal with the urgent question of unemployment, turned out to be nothing more than a vote snatching affair. Mr. MacDonald "reminded the Conference of how the workers had voted in 1918, etc., etc." For the rest the union leaders have discovered the virtues of democracy in the unions, and are busy referring the defeats to the rank and file.

The revolutionary movement has been affected somewhat differently. It has not yet adjusted itself to the ideas thrown into the forefront by the Russian Revolution and the Communist International. We have accordingly much protesting, a variety of proposals, a variety of slogans, and, therefore, a considerable amount of confusion.

An analysis of the protests will show that these fall into two principal categories, viz.: protests against the leaders of labour and protests against the forms of union organisation. The first is typically expressed by our valiant comrade, T. Mann, in the *Daily Herald* (December 9th):—"Refuse to allow executives to shape the policy for the rank and file. The membership must decide upon the objective and the policy by which it shall be achieved, and E.C.s and officials must carry out the desires of their members." This is echoed and re-echoed by many of our industrialist and syndicalist comrades throughout the country, both in the R.T.U.I. and the Workers' Committee movement.

This form of protest will not do. How can the rank and file shape their policy without leaders? And as to the question of referring the policy back to the rank and file, are we not balloting on our defeats? As a matter of fact, the union leaders are only too anxious in the present state of affairs to refer problems back to the rank and file in order to justify their own cowardice and incapacity. The issue of to-day is not one of referring the policy

back to the rank and file on a ballot paper; it should be that of the effective control of leadership. The demand to-day is for leaders to *lead*: not for them to become errand boys. If they are not prepared to do this, then we must find ways and means of removing them. Leaders we need and leaders we must have. The democracy which the revolutionaries should aim at is the democracy which will enable the workers to do more than merely examine a ballot paper and register a cross. It must enable the workers to quickly remove leaders who will not lead.

It will be argued that there is no disagreement upon the imperative need to remove the reactionary leaders. But even the demand for new leaders may become declamatory and formal. Denunciation is sometimes followed by the cry, "elect new leaders." Such a form of denunciation cuts little ice, and the cry of "elect new leaders" sounds very much like an echo of the old socialist parties. There is nothing wrong about that so long as it is not merely an echo; the limitations of the slogan are clearly recognised, and the necessary measures indicated to show that we are not as formalistic as the predecessors of the Communist Party. Elect new leaders by all means, but will someone kindly calculate the number of years necessary for the formal ballot box removal of the reactionary trade union bureaucracy? I cannot. It was the futility of this hope that drove revolutionary industrialists into the attempt to build new unions. They did not solve the problem that way, and neither can we. Such a policy suffers from the same limitations as that from which they fled. The struggle of the masses is not formal and mechanical. It is a dynamic struggle, and none of its problems, whether of organisation or leadership, can be satisfactorily met so long as we persist in approaching them either with a yard stick or a book of formulæ. The reactionary leaders will have to go. But they will have to be removed by a struggle directed against them rather than through formal removal via the ballot box.

This does not mean that we should relax for one moment the attack through the union ballot box, any more than we should reject parliamentarism because we do not believe the proletariat will attain power through parliamentarism. Indeed, the ballot box method stands in the same category, in relation to unionism, as Parliamentarism does in relation to the conquest of the state. Both are weapons to be used to the utmost of our power, although their limitations are obvious. In neither case have we control of the elected person. One of the elementary measures we should popularise and bring into practice, wherever immediately possible, in the trade union branch and elsewhere, is the right of having the power to recall the elected person.

Then we should consider larger measures of organised action whereby the masses will thrust aside the reactionaries as the struggle widens and deepens. In this task we are also behindhand. For example, the immediate situation demands resistance to wage reductions, resistance to the demand for the lengthening of the working day, counter proposals for the raising of wages, shortening of hours, work or full maintenance for the unemployed, etc. On these matters there is general agreement. The trouble arises when we consider ways and means. One section cries out for One Union

for One Industry, another for One Big Union, and some for Workers' Committees. The inherent weakness in these demands does not lie in its theoretical unsoundness, from the standpoint of organisation in keeping with the integration of industry, but in the fact that it does not meet the demands of the immediate situation. These people, with their different cries, do not get action on the issues I have mentioned. They side-track the masses on to a formal debate concerning *forms* of organisation, when everyone is wanting to know what we can do now with the immediate material at our disposal. If the immediate task before the workers was the Control of Industry, then the demand for One Union for One Industry would be urgent and pressing. But that is not the immediate problem. It may become so; and even then, in view of the cumbersome machinery of the unions, an improvisation would have to be made in the form of Workers' Committees. At the moment it is well nigh impossible to get either. The swiftly changing phases of the struggle have swept away the conditions which made the Shop Stewards and the Workers' Committees the natural mass expression of the requirements of the moment. These can best thrive when organisation is relatively strong or when the employers are deprived of a glutted "unemployment market." Neither condition obtains to-day. The multiplicity of divisions in the ranks of unionism, with no central controlling authority over them, leaves the union movement in a disorganised and consequently weak position. Even the unemployed organisations, flung up by the new conditions, have become largely sectional bodies struggling against isolation. How hopeless is the cry for Workers' Committees or Industrial Unions as a means for immediate action! Desirable? Yes. So is the social revolution. They are better forms of organisation, undoubtedly. So is Communism better than capitalism. But the immediate situation does not permit of these desirable things.

Not for one moment am I throwing cold water on Industrial Unionism, as a theory of organisation, or combating the idea that the union movement tends in that direction, or that the propaganda on its behalf should cease. That would be ridiculous in the face of the facts of trade union history. But I am anxious to emphasise the limitations of this line of approach to the immediate and pressing problems before us, and to insist that even this problem becomes solved through the struggle and conflict with capitalism. This has been the case throughout their history. The forms of organisation extant show quite clearly that the unions have not evolved simply and directly according to the form of industry. Rather have they followed the forms of the struggle as successive strata of the proletariat have become capable of organisation. The artisans formed their craft unions. Later followed the occupational unions and the general labour union as the integration of industry divided the crafts and roused the "unskilled" to organisational activity. Then their organisations were spread over all industries and not concentrated in terms of a single industry. Then later came the women's organisations, which again embraced workers in a number of industries. The more individual industries have asserted themselves as the determining factors of the struggle the more the unions have been impelled in the direction of the industrial form. Even the general labour unions have had to adapt themselves to this pressure,

and to-day it is a problem of unionism as to how the unions, which ought to broaden their basis to the industrial form, can overcome the difficulty of the general labour unions. The broadening of the one means the cutting up of the others. Again the struggle will solve the problem. It is not now this industry and now that, or now this section of workers and now that, which is coming into action. All industries and all sections of the proletariat are in deep distress and all the unions are having their illusions and their limitations hammered out of them by bitter experience. All forces are converging rapidly on to the class issue and the struggle for power, long before the electoral transformation of the leadership and long before the unions are transformed into industrial unions. We need, therefore, much more than our efforts to get new leaders elected through the ballot box. We need much more than the propaganda for industrial unionism. We need *plans* of immediate organised action, definitely related to the existing organisational forces of the proletariat, the application of which will force them into *action*. For it is by action that situations are produced which offer the opportunities necessary for the revolutionary change of leadership.

Two outstanding crises within the last two years will indicate the force of this contention. The first was that of the threatened war on Soviet Russia. The crisis threw up the Councils of Action. The Central Council was dominated by leaders who were more concerned about conciliating the British Government than achieving peace with Russia, and most certainly did not reflect the will of the local councils. The Central Council, however, retained its hold upon the situation. This was not the result of brilliant measures on their part, but simply because no effort was prepared which would lead to their removal as the crisis developed. Had a vigorous criticism of their policy been maintained, had the idea of new leadership representing the local councils of action been steadily fostered, the possibility of securing new leadership would have been advanced enormously, and its minimum effect would have been to force the Central authority to a more vigorous policy.

The second crisis found the revolutionary movement equally unprepared. We gave vigorous criticism of the leaders of the union movement in the crisis leading to Black Friday. We exposed them. We warned the masses to "Watch their Leaders." We fostered the idea that the Triple Alliance would fail. But when it did fail the revolutionary movement was almost as demoralised as the union movement in general. We had not, to any great extent, considered or advised the masses what they could do in such an eventuality. Yet everything cried out for the preparation of a new centre of leadership in the organisations involved, to which the masses could gravitate as the leaders moved towards failure.

The lesson is obvious and exceedingly important. Immediately there are the least signs of action developing in any organisation the revolutionary movement, and especially the Communist Party, ought to immediately take the measure of all the forces operating, the potentialities of the situation, the limitations of the organisations involved, and how the organisations can be used to drive the leaders along the revolutionary path or out of the way. Where there is no action, then we must look for means of action. Other crises will

develop. They may not come along the same route as these I have mentioned, but they will come. If we do not prepare ourselves to do more than work for change of leadership through the ballot box, the next crisis will find us unprepared in a situation akin to its predecessors. The leaders will continue to serenely manoeuvre "reasonable settlements" and retain their control of the masses irrespective of the treachery they may perform.

The call of the Communist International for us to "Go Back to the Masses," therefore, will have little effect unless we take "the goods" along with us, which will enable them to immediately use the means at their disposal, their present leaders, their present organisations to get action. By this kind of leadership the revolutionary movement will demonstrate to the working class the correctness of its claims. Such a policy will lead the masses into the revolutionary struggle, and through the struggle, to new leadership and to power.

Are You a Member of an Economic Class?

Thousands of Young Communists are attending economic classes. That is just as it should be. Many of the new students at these classes are not Communists. That is not as it should be. How can you interest them in the Party?

It is very simple.

You have only to hang up a COMMUNIST REVIEW advertisement card in the class room and book orders for the REVIEW.

By doing this you will be helping the student. You will be helping to make new readers for the COMMUNIST REVIEW. But, above all, you will be helping to make new members for the Party.

**Get a Card for Your Class Room
GET IT TO-DAY!**

Communism or Reformism Which ?

By MAURICE H. DOBB

[We have been asked by many new readers of the *Communist Review*, some of whom are anxious to know the vital points that separate the Communists from the moderate Socialists, to make a comprehensive statement on Communism and to show wherein it differs from Reformist Socialism. We have also received several letters from new recruits to the Party, many of whom have recently come over from the I.L.P., to the effect that a thorough study of Communist fundamentals would be useful to them as a basis for discussion with some of their former colleagues. In order to meet these requests we publish the following exposition by Comrade Maurice H. Dobb. It is not an elementary statement and is not meant for the purpose of popular propaganda ; indeed, it was originally prepared as a Paper for the Cambridge University Socialist Society. In order to retain the unity of the argument we have not broken up the statement into a series of monthly instalments, but have published it, despite its length, complete.]

We also print a bibliography at the end. It contains a list of books by critics of Communism. We do this because we have a strong case and do not desire to emulate the narrow bigotry of those I.L.P. leaders, who, in their party publications, are afraid to encourage their members to study the other side.—Editor, *Communist Review*.]

I.

The Conflict of Theories

AMID the irrelevant absurdities and obnoxious personalities clouding the controversy which is going on over the whole industrialised world to-day between the Revolutionary Communism of the Third International and the Reformist (more or less) Socialism of the Second International, there is much need for an academic study of the real fundamental issues underlying these two opposing theories. Is it merely a conflict between the "wild men," unlettered, unreasoning, passionate, on the one hand, and the slow, wise, cautious, practical men on the other? Is the movement "leftward" during the last few years with its growing impatience with the Reformist programs, which have hitherto in most countries held the field, really as Mr. Snowden would have us believe, merely an emotional effervescence, stimulated by sympathy with the heroic endurance of the Russian Revolution? Is it on a mere verbal or theoretical quibble, on mere impatient energy unable to find more useful outlet, on mere personal jealousy of leaders on the part of lesser men, that the numerous "splits" in the Socialist Parties of various countries have taken place—between Lenin and Martov in Russia, between Zetkin and Kautsky in Germany, between Bombacci and Turati in Italy, between Cachin and Longuet in France, between the C.P.G.B. and the I.L.P. in England? Anyone who dispassionately and adequately analyses the two doctrines cannot but come to the conclusion that such statements of this important difference lamentably ignore the fundamental issues.

Mr. C. R. Fay, of Cambridge, in his "*Life and Labour in the Nineteenth Century*," in referring to these two trends of Socialist thought, which he designates as respectively "Revolutionary" and "Evolutionary," emphasises that the difference is not one of a party of peace and a party of violence. It is clear that this statement is correct. But Mr. Fay seems to be on weaker ground when he goes on to differentiate the two parties as those who wish to do a number of things simultaneously and those who wish to do a number of things gradually and successively. True there is this difference to a certain extent; but it does not mark the fundamental line of cleavage, and is, in fact, as stated, likely to be misleading. Lenin has no illusions about the possibility of change before evolution is ripe for it, as Mr. Fay's statement on the face of it would seem to suggest; nor do Communists believe that the world can be transformed in the twinkling of an eye before the bayonets of the Red Guards, as before the swords of the Saracens or the armies of Charlemagne. The kernel of the aims of Communism is not so much the complete transformation, from pure individualism to pure Communism, at one fell "coup d'etat"—if anything that is the Anarchist conception—but rather the necessity of the transference of economic, and hence political power from the Bourgeoisie to the Proletariat as the fulcrum of the transformation of all the institutions of society. This question of the relation of class to the ownership of the means of production, and not any mere abstract "idea," is the key to our problem; and to this we must constantly direct our attention.

The root difference may be summarised as a difference of two opposing sociological conceptions—if the formidable phrase may be pardoned. This difference expresses itself in three ways: (1) In the analysis of the present system of Capitalism; (2) In the nature of the system aimed at to remedy the evils of Capitalism; (3) In the *method* advocated for the achievement of the transition from Capitalism to Socialism. It is clear that a cleavage of opinion in the case of (1) will inevitably result in a cleavage of opinion over (2) and (3) as well. It is here, therefore, that we must look for the basis of all the distinctions in theory and practice between Communism and Reformist Socialism. In fact, if either of the two opposing theories are in any way scientific this must be so—ruling out faults in logic, which would suppose lack of intellect in the framers of the theory—since it is only from analysis of the present that inductions can be made as to the basis of method and aims of the future. Anything else would be merely Utopian, emotional and non-intellectual, and therefore incapable of theoretical analysis.

The Reformist Socialist, the Fabian and of the I.L.P., for the most part reject the Marxian analysis of Capitalism, accepting it, if they accept it at all, merely as a "descriptive fact," but not as the basis of "political method," to use McDonald's phrase. They base their criticism of Capitalism mainly on the "Fabian Essays" and on the writings of Henry George and the land reformers. Their Economics they take from the orthodox school in the line of J. S. Mill, Jevons, Cairns, Marshall and Pigou. The main point of their attack on Capitalism is (a) the waste of competition, or, where competition has given place to combination; (b) the evil of

monopolistic Trusts; and (c) the injustice of certain outstanding forms of "monopoly" or "quasi-monopoly rent," chief being "economic rent" and "unearned increment" of land. Having this as their basis, quite logically they propound, as a compound remedy for these defects of Capitalism, nationalisation, with eventual socialisation to dispense with the "rent" payment of interest. At first this would be merely of monopolies and key-industries, where the defects of Capitalism are most glaring. This scheme would involve the centralisation of industry under the control of some organ of the State. The State, the instrument of a democratic community, would be the sole owner of the means of wealth production, and the sole employer. There is a presumption in favour of the view that the State as employer would be more benevolent than individual competing employers, who are forced by pressure of competition to cut down wages to a minimum. In a word, they seek to replace the wastes of "laissez-faire" competition and the injustice of monopoly by State Collectivism. The excessive centralisation of this bureaucratic scheme has been modified during the last few years under the pressure of the propaganda of the "intellectuals" of the National Guilds League by the grafting on to State Collectivism of joint industrial control by the workers in the industry. The Sankey scheme, accepted by the Labour Party, is an instance of this. The pure Guild Socialists go further, and with an aversion to the "wage system," which is more often a sentimental rather than an intellectual aversion, seek to place control entirely in the hands of the workers and only ownership in the community as a whole.

The method by which the Reformist Socialist seeks to achieve this also follows logically, once given the basic premises to which reference has already been made. Universal Suffrage now gives to the workers the power of using Parliament to better their conditions, and to transform society, if they will. The duty of the workers is, therefore, primarily to organise *politically*, so as to secure reforms. These reforms will make them fit for further reforms; and ultimately, when they have seen that the true road to their own betterment lies in the Socialist ideal, they will send a Socialist majority into Parliament, which will proceed to nationalise land and industry gradually, as conditions are ripe for the change, and without any violent disturbance which might harm the economic system of the country. In this way the working-class will use political power to effect economic change, and political democracy will be consummated by economic democracy.

The Guild Socialists* do not trust so much in Parliament, but rely on "encroaching control" by the workers in industry, a method which at present is clouded in vagueness and has not been very clearly mapped out. At any rate, they regard this "encroachment" as being constitutional, i.e., within the legal limits set by Parliamentary legislation. Hence the complete socialisation of industry by this method would almost certainly be limited by political power, and would, therefore, be dependent on the capture

(* I refer here, of course, to the Reformist Guildsmen, such as Tawney, Reckitt, Slesser; and not to the left-wing members of the National Guilds League (now in a majority) who are at any rate theoretically Communists.

of Parliament by a Socialist Majority. To this extent, therefore, this method does not differ very fundamentally from the pure Parliamentary method. Those Guildsmen, like Cole, who adopt the "centre" position that, although favouring constitutional "encroaching control" most of the way, they believe that at some point the change must be catastrophic and unconstitutional, are merely balancing between the two stools of the Communist and the Reformist conceptions.

This method, it is argued, may be slow, but it is sure. It is constitutional, and so will not call down on its head the power of State repression, and will dispense with the necessity for any violent revolution, which before in history has been inevitable to secure change, because democracy did not exist. On the other hand, any violent change would be dangerous. Besides the horrors of civil war and all that a revolution of force may mean, a sudden change—a "leap in the dark"—without any preliminary experimentation, runs the very grave risk of failure, and with it the complete breakdown of the economic system of civilisation. Moreover the Communist is apt to be blinded by the means into a neglect of the end. Unconstitutional action is anti-democratic; it implies dictatorship and the tyranny of a class. This is retrogression, not progress, and class hatreds engendered by class war will form a bad foundation for the altruism and social democracy of a new state of society. The means employed may well entirely defeat the end.

Now, there is no question that this Fabian method is the most humane and the most desirable. The point on which the Communist differs is its *POSSIBILITY*. That is the real crux of the question, on which any argument on Communism must turn. For this reason eloquent Snowdonian and MacDonaldesque dissertations on the ethical desirability of the Fabian method are really irrelevant as refutations of the Communists' position, for it is not the relative *desirability* of the two methods that is at issue, but their *possibility*. "We must be realists," says the Communist, "and have the moral courage to face facts, however unpleasant."

The Communist answer to this consists in a complete denial of the adequacy of the Fabian's premiss; namely, his critical analysis of Capitalism, the correctness of which the Fabian is rather apt to take for granted. He will reply something like this: "Your Fabian Socialism is but the Socialism of civil servants and the professional class; your I.L.P. Socialism is the Socialism of shopkeepers and other small property-owners, who are adversely affected by some of the actions of Big Capital and the Trusts. When we say this we do not use the phrase as a mere meaningless term of vulgar abuse. We use it to denote a fundamental and oft neglected fact, namely, that your critical analysis of Capitalism is faulty, in that your economic position in society provides you with only a partial view of the true essence of Capitalism. Psychologists tell us that the most powerful "complex" or association of habits and ideas centres around the way in which a man gets his livelihood. Consequently his whole philosophy of life will tend to centre round this "complex," and so be unconsciously moulded by his economic position. For not only do ideas springing into consciousness get

shaped by and emotionally "coloured" by these mental "complexes" in the subconscious mind, but impressions coming to the mind from outside and relegated to the memory get sorted out and "weighted" quite unconsciously by the emotional influence of these dominant "complexes." Hence the middle class person—the professional man or the small property owner—will tend to view from a different angle, as it were, and analyse the social system differently (unless some strong emotional influence or a strong power of imagination has changed the unconscious substratum of his mind) from what the proletarian living in the workshop, from week to week, will do.

"This is why your analysis of the present system is faulty. Only a *part* of the evils of Capitalism come within your economic experience; quite unconsciously you tend to 'weight' these more heavily; and consequently your conception of the present system is only *partial*. The proletariat, which is exploited by every phase of Capitalism, and bears the whole burden of "surplus value" on its shoulders, alone can envisage the whole of the capitalist system of exploitation. You only partially see and realise the class struggle; to the class-conscious proletarian it is a vital fact of his everyday and all-day workshop experience. Hence proletarian Socialism, expressing the psychology of the proletariat, provides the only *practicable* remedy for *all* the evils of Capitalism; your lower-middle-class Socialism, based on a lower-middle-class outlook, is a remedy for only some of the evils of Capitalism, and is impracticable."

He will go on to point out, having given this little lesson in elementary psychology, that the vital flaw in the Reformist theory is the supposition that Parliamentary Democracy is real; or, to put it differently, that there is sufficient social solidarity in capitalist society for the "collective egoism" or "general will" to be expressed in an impartial body above society, the State; for on this supposition depends the whole theory of Parliamentary Democracy. Without that assumption the whole Reformist theory of attaining Socialism through Democracy falls obviously to the ground. "This is where your petit-bourgeois outlook becomes apparent," the Communist will say triumphantly: "Your type of mind does not see through this particular phenomenon of Capitalism. The economic subjection of the proletariat enables it to throw off completely the mesmerism of bourgeois ideology* and to see this fact in its correct perspective."

In opposition to this basic assumption that Parliamentary Democracy as at present existing is real, the Communist asserts the following:—

- (a) That there is no social solidarity or general will in capitalist society: there is a fundamental social antithesis, between the bourgeoisie, who get their living from ownership, and the proletariat, who get their living from selling labour-power for wages. This gives rise to a clash of opposing psychologies and wills—the class struggle.
- (b) That economic power dominates political power; hence the dominant economic class—those who have a class-monopoly of the

(*) "Ideology" means any system of ideas, theories and sentiments.

means of production—hold the real power in society. Parliamentary Democracy merely masks this fact. The habit of bourgeois Political Science of treating the political side of society as in a separate water-tight compartment leads to this error; Marxian Science treats society as a unitary whole, the relation of man's mind to his environment; and in man's mind the political and moral and economic are not separate of one another, but interacting.

- (c) That since wills of different persons on different matters are of different intensity, the Parliamentary method of expressing the general will by the simple process of "counting noses" gives a distorted expression of the general will. For instance, the majority, having no very definite political will, may vote for things remaining the same, while a minority may be suffering very severely from existing conditions and may have a very intense will to change them. This was the case in France during last century, when the innately conservative peasants opposed changes which would have benefitted large sections in the towns. Therefore a mere numerical register of individual wills, which is Parliament, may not represent quantitatively the real will of a community any better than a revolutionary dictatorship. In normal times it will probably do so; in times of social crisis it often does not.

"Believing, therefore," the Communist will say, "the class struggle to be a fact and to be inherent in Capitalism, and seeing that Parliamentary Democracy is only a mask hiding the true fact of the Dictatorship of the property-owners, based upon their class-monopoly of the means of production, we are not bound down in slavish submission to constitutionalism. In seeking to reach economic power *through political power*, i.e., through the political organs of capitalist dictatorship, you hopelessly misread the problem and are foredoomed to failure. All you will achieve that way is possibly a measure of State Capitalism and concessions granted by the Plutocracy to ease the class struggle. The only way in which the capitalist autocracy can be defeated and the proletariat achieve its emancipation is by the *economic power* of the proletariat. This proletarian power, as De Leon showed, consists, and can only consist, in industrial organisation in the workshop finding militant expression in direct proletarian action aimed against capitalist control of industry. To this end the proletariat must build up *its own institutions*, framed to give expression to *its own needs* in this class struggle for control of industry, opposed to the instruments of Capitalist Dictatorship. So, by attaining economic power the acquisition of political power will follow."

Apart from this question as to whether the "social-democratic" method is not based on an illusion, there are certain reasons of expediency in favour of industrial as against purely political action for emancipating the working-class. These have been popularised during the last twenty years by the Industrial Unionists, such as De Leon in America and Conolly and Tom Mann in England. These arguments of expediency may be briefly summarised as follows:—

- (i) Very much greater than the danger of the Communist losing the end in the means is the danger of the Parliamentarian losing the final goal through too great absorption in the successive details of

the Fabian opportunist struggle. The opportunist Parliamentarian—and from the nature of his task the Parliamentarian is inevitably opportunist—may be so blinded by the exaggerated importance of “the next step” on the Fabian road, that he may be led quite honestly to concede for the sake of temporal electoral advantage something, which unnoticed by his opportunist short-sightedness takes him further down the road *away* from Socialism than his temporary electoral advantage takes him *towards* it. It is a fact verifiable in everyday experience that the man too engrossed in the practical details of a small sphere is very apt to “see no further than the end of his nose.” The Parliamentarian engaged in a fierce political struggle for this and that small reform tends to exaggerate the importance of those small reforms, and to lose sight of the final goal at which he is supposed to be aiming.

To give an instance; a politician might well seek to gain support for a scheme of nationalisation of railways (being engrossed in the struggle on that detailed issue and so unconsciously exaggerating it in his mind into an end in itself rather than a mere means to something further) by conceding to public opinion a scheme of compulsory arbitration to prevent strikes, thereby fettering the freedom of Trade Unions, the only economic weapon of the proletariat.

- (ii) Parliament is of little use in dealing with a class war, as both Trotsky and Dean Inge have rightly remarked. At times in history, when the economic basis of society is decomposing or changing rapidly, the political factors inevitably lag behind and tend to be controlled by rather than to control economic change. It is in the workshop, the centre of the vortex, that the economic events are taking place which are generating the psychology of change in men's minds. The Parliamentarian out of touch with this—at the outside edge, not at its centre—will not appreciate to the full the real movement of events, and a crisis in the industrial sphere will almost inevitably forestall any political action to remedy it.
- (iii) The opinions of the unthinking mass of the people are largely moulded by the environment of existing society; their root ideas and prejudices and the unconscious assumptions on which they act having been formed by upbringing inside this environment. Consequently the opinions of the mass of people, who do not reason very deeply, will not be likely to change till *after* their social environment has been revolutionised. At any rate it will be well nigh impossible to stir their innate conservatism into enthusiasm for abstract political issues and for happenings far from them in—say—Westminster. It will be possible, however, to arouse their enthusiasm on matters which touch their close-at-hand and everyday interests. In other words, the only way in which the “emotional influences” of the unthinking mass can be generated and harnessed in the direction of a change in the economic system is by *class* organisation of the workers in the workshop, where they all find a common ground of contention against the system which oppresses them, and not by political organisation in political constituencies. As Rosa Luxemburg, the German Communist, succinctly put it, “In the Workshop the chains of capitalism are forged, and there must they be broken asunder.”

II.

The Marxian Position

NOW, this viewpoint of the Communist largely depends, in its root assumptions, on a certain philosophic theory of social evolution. This theory is based on a study of history and was termed by its authors, Marx and Engels, Historical Materialism. A brief elucidation of this sociological conception is, therefore, a necessary part of our examination of the fundamental difference between Reformist Socialism and Communism. An attempt will be made to do this with as little use of technical language as is possible. Marxian scholars must pardon any omissions arising from this attempt at brevity and simplicity.

First, to clear away a misconception. The term "Materialism" has no connection with *philosophic* materialism in the absolute and final sense; nor does it express a preference for the animal rather than the spiritual qualities of man. As Prof. Ferri, the Italian Darwinian, claims, it merely does for social evolution what Darwinism has done for biological evolution; but it does not wander into the realm of metaphysical assumptions as to the "absolute" or "final" nature of the phenomena it investigates. Eden and Cedar Paul, in their *Creative Revolution*, write:—

"Historical Materialism is quite distinct from Philosophic Materialism. . . . Marx did not assert, as do the materialists in the philosophic meaning of the term that the only "real" things in the universe are matter and motion. Nor did his doctrine involve a belief in determinism in the materialistic sense."

Again, Harry Waton, an American Marxist, says:—

"The philosophy of Marx is not an ontology: it is not a philosophy of the universe. It does not attempt to explain the ultimate nature of things, nor does it undertake to discover the final cause and ultimate aim of Creation. The philosophy of Marx is a philosophy of human society."*

Another vulgar misapprehension is the supposition that this theory discountenances the value of idealism or presupposes that man is influenced only by conscious selfish motives. Boudin, another American Marxist, is most emphatic on this point.

"The ideas which prevail in a given society," he says, "exert a powerful influence on that society. These ideas, however, have their source in the social milieu of that society, which milieu in its turn is the result of the economic relations of that society. . . . A man may very well act against his own interests . . . for the sake of an ideal, and yet his action may be the result of the material interests of a class or group to which he belongs or which produced that ideal."†

"In our doctrine," says Prof. Labriola, "we have not to retranslate into economic categories all the complex manifestations of history, but only to explain in the *last analysis* all the historic facts by means of the underlying structure."‡

What, then, is the significance of the term "materialism?" Its significance is that this doctrine teaches that the forms and

(*) *The Radical Review*, July, 1917.

(†) *The Theoretical System of Karl Marx* (Kerr & Co., Chicago).

(‡) *Essays on the Materialistic Conception of History* (Kerr & Co.).

institutions of society at any given period of history are moulded in conformity with the demands of the particular forms of production then existing; and that it is to changes in the material substratum of society, to which changes in the social superstructure of ideas, institutions, and relations can, in the *last analysis*, be traced. Croce, in fact, suggests that to avoid the vulgar misapprehension of the term "materialism," the theory should be called the Realistic Interpretation of History. No doubt this would express the essence of the theory just as well. But Materialistic was the term its authors used, and so it had better remain.

The Marxian takes as the premiss of his theory the fact, clearly established by modern psychology, that man's mind—his ideas, conations and impulses—is shaped by the action of the environment, in contact with which man's development has taken place; his fundamental and hereditary instincts being modified, "sublimated," and developed by impressions coming to the mind from things with which his senses come into relation. These impressions are repressed to the region of the unconscious, and being associated with some emotional "affect" form the impulses, often unconscious, which govern his action in life. Man, in the course of his evolution, has created tools. With these tools he has altered the natural environment, and shaped it to his own ends, thereby creating an *economic environment*, created out of, and on top of the natural environment, forming the basis of all human society, and separating man from the mere animal. It is in the reactions of this economic environment on man, giving rise by its modifying action on the mind of the new generation to fresh ideas and impulses, which in their turn lead to the creation of new tools, and with them further alterations of the economic environment, that the history of human society consists.

Since all other spheres of man's life depend upon his procuring of the material means of life, and since this depends upon the way in which he co-operates with tools and with his fellow-men, *it is upon this economic factor—his relation through his tools to the economic environment—that the whole of man's social life depends.* This relation is the foundation plan which shapes the whole superstructure. We have already seen in another connection that the way in which a man gets his livelihood plays the largest part in his experience and plays the largest part in directly forming his mental habits and ideas and desires. In man's mind the ideas and impulses which actuate him in *all* his actions, whether political, moral, æsthetic, or intellectual, are but the product of previous experience, and this experience consists, ultimately, in a series of relations with the economic environment. Therefore it is to changes in the relation between men associated together, and the tools with which they create their economic environment out of nature, says the Marxist, to which we can finally trace all social changes and to which we must look for the guiding thread of the historical process.

Using this theoretical concept in relation to the concrete facts of history, the Marxist points out that the history of man organised in political society has been the history of *class struggles*. After the break-up of the early communal societies, which the researches of Haxthausen in Russia, of Maurer in Germany, and of Morgan

universally have shown to have existed everywhere at the dawn of human history, society became cleft with a division between "tool-owners" and "tool-users." This took place probably by conquest and invasion, pressed on by force of increasing population, of less warlike or less advanced by more warlike tribes, and the enslavement of the former by the latter. This particular social relation, essential at that time to social progress, necessitated the "coercive association" of labour (to use Prof. Loria's term* as the form of production, based on the subjection of the non-owners (proletariat) to the owners.

Now, the division of society into a class of owners and a class of non-owners created a fundamental social *antithesis* between the two. The relation of the owning class to the economic environment was in every respect different and antithetical to the relation of the proletariat to the economic environment. The economic interests (for short we will use Loria's term "egoism") and the whole mental outlook, habits, ideas, and impulses of the two classes were, and are to-day, placed in opposition. This antithesis of psychologies and wills is the class struggle; and it finds expression throughout society. Being fundamental it could only be prevented from breaking out into actual physical conflict or open class war, thereby destroying the form of production and probably society itself, by the forcible suppression of the "egoism" of the proletariat. So long as this particular form of production was essential to the economic needs of society, it had to be preserved in this way. Therefore, since that time the forms of production—all variations of the "coercive association" of labour—have demanded that social institutions shall be so framed as to pervert the "egoism" of the proletariat and to keep them in subjection. The chief means by which the *perversion* of proletarian egoism takes place is by the dissemination of different forms of dominant class "ideology" through the avenue of the schools, the university, the church, and nowadays the Press. The *subjection* of the proletariat into such a position as shall ensure the continuance and productivity of the "coercive association" is secured by the legal and political and military systems, centralised under the State.

Says Prof. Labriola:—

"The State is a real organisation of defence to guarantee and perpetuate a mode of association, the foundation of which is a form of economic production."†

Says Engels:—

"The State has not always existed. There were societies which did without it. . . . At a given stage of economic development, which was necessarily bound up with the break up of society into classes, the State became a necessity." "The State is an organisation of the exploiting class for the support of its external conditions of production, therefore in particular for the forcible retention of the exploited class in such conditions of oppression (such as slavery, serfdom, wage-labour) as are determined by the given methods of production. . . . In

(* This is the translation preferred by Eden and Cedar Paul. Prof. Keasbey in his translation of Loria's *Economic Foundations of Society* uses the term "forced association."

(†) *Essays on the Materialistic Interpretation of History* (Kerr & Co.).

ancient times it was the State of the Slave-owners; in the middle ages it was the State of the Feudal nobility; in our own times it is the State of the capitalists. When ultimately the State becomes the representative of the whole of society, it will make itself superfluous.”^a

But the reactions of the economic environment on man, and the pressure of population on social subsistence is continually causing a shifting of economic conditions. New tools are created, to increase the productivity of labour. With the coming of new tools comes the need for new forms of production and new social relations between men and classes; and the old forms of production, and the old systems of “ideology” and of social institutions framed to preserve them, become obsolete. So society enters upon a period of social revolution; and a new class of owners—those owning the new instruments of production—gain economic, and hence political ascendancy. As Marx expresses it in that masterly and oft-quoted summary in his “*Criticism of Political Economy*” :—

“At a certain stage of their development the material productive forces in society come in conflict with the existing relations of production, or—what is but a legal expression for the same thing—with the property relations within which they had been at work before. From forms of development of the forces of production these relations turn into their fetters. Then comes the period of social revolution. With the change of the economic foundation the entire immense superstructure is more or less rapidly transformed.”[†]

So society has passed through what Prof. Loria has termed the “slave-economy,” the “serf-economy,” the “wage-economy”—all variations of the “coercive association” of labour—corresponding to the classical, mediæval and modern social epochs. But a double broad dynamic tendency of change in the economic environment is visible in this development. In the first place, as Loria points out, in order that each form of the “coercive association” should be more productive than the preceding one (i.e., serf-labour more productive than slave-labour, and wage-labour than serf-labour) it was necessary that some of the politico-legal fetters on the labourer should in each case be removed, and his position be one of relatively greater freedom from hampering legal restrictions. This was made possible by the second tendency, namely, that the growth in the size and complexity of the instruments of production made them automatically more and more the monopoly of the wealthy class; and by this monopoly, together with the disappearance of free and unoccupied land, the subjection of the proletariat was *automatically* secured by force of economic circumstances alone, without the necessity for additional (and withal expensive) political and legal restrictions. Thus it is that we find the watchwords of Bourgeois ideology at the beginning of last century to be political equality and “laissez-faire” (let alone), which involved the removal of all restrictions on the mobility of labour. But although under modern Capitalism there is political equality in name, the legal restrictions, which fettered the serf or slave have gone, yet the subjection of the proletariat is just as real as before, *the subjection being now enforced by economic circumstances alone.*

(*) Quoted by Lenin in his *State and Revolution*.

(†) From the translation by N. I. Stone in the Kerr & Co. edition.

With the demand for rapid increase of productivity under Capitalism in the interests of the possessing class, there arose the demand among enlightened capitalists for a further amelioration in the conditions of labour as the best means of increasing the productivity of labour, and hence profits. Thus arose the theory of the Economy of High Wages and the modern Liberal and Social Reform movements. It was really a continuation of the ameliorating tendency, to which reference has just been made. As the champion of this new line of Bourgeois thought we see J. S. Mill.

But this very improvement in the conditions of labour, dictated by the demands of capitalist production, gave birth to the modern proletarian movement, destined to bring capitalist production to an end. For, better social conditions aroused the self-consciousness of the proletariat, and education provided the proletariat with reasoning power and sufficient manliness to revolt against his subjection and to see the way out. The Marxian historical theory has given to the proletariat the intellectual tool by which it may secure its emancipation and build up a new society. The psychology of the proletariat being diametrically opposed to that of the bourgeoisie, their outlook on life, their estimate of social values, their ideal aspirations, it follows that the proletariat will build up, as it develops consciousness of its distinctive egoism, a proletarian culture of its own, with distinctive intellectual inductions from its distinctive experience in the realms of social science, and in art and philosophy, which are almost wholly subjective. For experience is relative, and it is only from experience, first or second-hand, that the inductions which constitute "theory" can be raised.

We have seen, then, that the prime necessity of the "coercive association" of labour is the suppression of the egoism of the proletariat and the directing dominance of the egoism of the possessing class. With the growth of the proletarian movement, as has just been shown, a proletarian ideology, the social antithesis, or class struggle, hitherto dormant, becomes accentuated; and this fact tends seriously to lessen the productivity of the "coercive association." The result is that the "social revenue" (not to be confused with the State revenue) tends to enter upon a relative decline. Together with this tendency goes the necessity for the continual reinvestment of profits in the exploitation of labour-power, this necessity being expressed in the recurring over-production of "productive goods" (machinery, etc.), relative to consumable goods (food, clothing, etc.), which takes on formidable size and becomes a serious social disease with the growth in prominence of the iron and steel industries. This necessitates the opening up of new markets and fields of investment abroad. The former tendency produces an acquisitive spirit of conquest, and the latter a desire for economic expansion. Says Prof. Loria:—"The revenue, which is unable to retard its own decline by any physiological methods devised to increase production, is compelled to have recourse to pathological means—the violent appropriation of the revenue of others."*

Thus, in place of the pacifism of Cobden and Bright and the early bourgeoisie, there has grown up since the seventies aggressive

(*) *Economic Causes of War* (Kerr & Co., Chicago).

modern Imperialism. The culmination of modern Imperialism with its rush to partition out the unexploited regions of the earth was the Great War of 1914, the effect of which has been to shatter both the material substance and the artificial economic organisation of civilisation almost beyond repair. While, as Maynard Keynes has shown,* the psychological legacy of the war—the imperialist spirit of the big Powers and the national jealousies of the small states—is making any reconstruction on the old basis well nigh impossible, and by immensely lowering the productivity of Capitalism is bringing starvation, the begetter of revolution, over Europe. This decline in the “social revenue” and the sharpening of the social antithesis, visible everywhere in industrial unrest and revolution, are symptoms of the fact that the institutions of capitalist class society “from forms of development of the forces of production” have turned into “fetters” upon production. This fact of economic necessity, and not any argument based on “ideal” and abstract issues, is the real case for Communism.

“Humanity, whose whole culture now lies in ruin, faces the danger of complete destruction. There is only one power which can save it—the power of the proletariat.”

Thus speaks the Manifesto of the Third International. From the collapse of Capitalism by reason of the irreconcilable contradictions inherent in the “coercive association” and with it the collapse of civilisation the only salvation, says the Communist, is to abolish capitalism based on class monopoly of the means of production and through the directing dictatorship of the egoism of the proletariat to usher in Communist society. The matter is urgent, and with civilisation at stake the proletariat cannot afford to indulge in hair-splittings over “constitutional” action or in compromises with the Bourgeois Dictatorship. No hope of peace and reconstruction is possible so long as Capitalism remains; for war and aggression will increase, rather than diminish in frequency and intensity, as the tendencies producing Imperialism, outlined above, increase.

From this conception of history the following deductions logically follow:—

- (a) That in spite of the form of bourgeois Parliamentary “democracy” the economic subjection of the proletariat to the property interests exists just as before.
- (b) That all the institutions of society have been moulded and dominated by the economic power of the bourgeoisie for the purpose of perpetuating the “coercive association” of labour by maintaining the subjection of the proletariat.
- (c) That it is in their ownership of the means of production that the power of the bourgeoisie is vested.
- (d) That the social antithesis, apparent as the class struggle, has its root in the economic division between a class which *owns* and a class which *labours*; which follows from private ownership of the means of production. This class division and struggle is, therefore, the inevitable product of a particular form of economic organisation.

From these principles the Communist logically draws the correlative conclusions:—

(*) *Economic Consequences of the Peace* (Macmillan & Co.).

- (a) That the existence of bourgeois "democracy" is of no assistance to the proletariat in its actual struggle for emancipation and for the overthrow of bourgeois dictatorship. This struggle, the culmination of the evolution of the proletarian movement, must therefore assume the tactics of a fight against an autocracy, and cannot take a "democratic" or purely Parliamentary form.
- (b) That it is impossible for the proletariat to use the existing bourgeois institutions as instruments for its emancipation. At best it can only capture them and render them useless to the Plutocracy. The proletariat must, therefore, *build its own institutions, moulded to its own needs, in order to supplant the Plutocratic State.*
- (c) That economic power is the foundation of political power; and therefore only by the *economic* power of the proletariat, aimed at wresting the instruments of production from class-monopoly, can bourgeois dictatorship be overthrown and the proletariat emancipated. The basis of all proletarian mass action must be consequently class-conscious organisation in the workshops finding expression in direct proletarian action, aimed at control of industry.
- (d) That with the dissolution of private ownership of the means of production, class divisions and the institutions, e.g., the State, framed to subject the non-owning class, will automatically disappear. This, however, can only be accomplished by the directing dominance of the "egoism" or "will" of the proletariat, whose interests naturally lie in the abolition of ownership rule.
- But while the dissolution of capitalist society is being carried out, and the foundations of communal ownership and its concomitant, the "free association" of labour, are being laid, it follows that the will of the proletariat must be more powerful than the will of the bourgeoisie. To this end the proletariat must, transitionally, use the State, as the bourgeoisie have done before them, to suppress any opposition to their directing will. This is the historic function of the Dictatorship of the Proletariat.

This policy does not necessarily imply an "impossibilist" attitude of refusal to take part in the immediate struggles of the masses pending the complete overthrow of Capitalism. It merely affirms that these struggles in the industrial and parliamentary fields, must be subordinate to the main aim—the class war against Capitalism. Lenin has expressly emphasised the necessity of participation in Parliamentary action, to hamper the full exercise of Bourgeois Dictatorship in its attempt to crush the proletarian movement, for the "permeation" of existing Labour Parties and Trade Unions, the weaning of them from the guidance of opportunist and reformist leaders with lower-middle-class rather than proletarian outlook.

III.

The Dictatorship of the Propertied Interests

THE Communist does not rely only on "*a priori*" proof of his assertion of the existence of Bourgeois Dictatorship, based on ownership of industry, and of the unreality of Parliamentary "democracy." He will show that if only the "coloured glasses" of bourgeois psychology or bourgeois ideology are removed, the fact is perfectly apparent. Naturally it is apparent

to the proletariat where it is not so to the middle class or lower-middle-class person, because the relation of the former to the economic environment, and hence his psychological outlook and egoism, is different from that of the latter. Hobbes wrote over two hundred years ago that "Wealth is Power," and the Communist affirms this to be as true to-day. Now, if this assertion is true, it must be shown that wealth and hence the wealthy class has considerable control over (i) the political will of the people as expressed in Parliamentary elections; (ii) the making of legislation by Parliament; (iii) the administration of these laws, and of the "common law." The Communist seeks to prove all three. He declares that (i) is achieved by the control of wealth over public opinion; (ii) by this fact and by the influence which wealth has over the Party machine and over the Cabinet, which mainly initiates legislation; (iii) by the control which wealth has over the executive and administrative organs of the State, and over the judiciary. Let us consider each of these sections separately.

As regards the control which the capitalist class exercises over public opinion, the whole position is admirably summed up by R. W. Postgate in his book, "*The Bolshevik Theory*." He points out that the theory of bourgeois democracy consists in the supposition that the real will of the whole people can be effectively and accurately represented by the simple process of "counting heads." But the supposition is not valid; for society is divided into two classes, propertied and propertyless, educated and little educated, master and servant. Lord Northcliffe, because he has sufficient wealth to control several large newspaper companies, is able to influence the opinions of several million electors, who are readers of his newspapers. The wealth of Northcliffe, therefore, magnifies the influence of his personal opinion a millionfold—virtually gives him influence over several million votes. The personal opinion of another man, on the other hand, who may be far abler and better educated than Lord Northcliffe, but who, not being wealthy has not the same influence, will in the process of "counting heads" only count for one—his own.

Even Mr. H. Noel Brailsford admits:—

"You cannot have a real control of political power in the hands of the masses, in the hands of all the workers, as long as you have working behind the scenes, working in the preparation of opinion, working in the schools, working above all in the Press, the all-powerful, the all-permeating capitalist system."

Capitalist parties with financial backing, too, always have the advantage actually in the details of an electoral contest—advantage in canvassing, in hiring speakers and halls, in propaganda, in motor-cars on election day, etc.—which means that on a broad average the result of an election is determined by the respective financial resources of the contesting parties. What Graham Wallas calls the Social Heritage is merely a system of ideas and theories built up by the owning class of the past, and its impartation through education is a form of unconscious upper class propaganda. Professors in Universities, who write books and frame orthodox theories; clergy of the Church who teach moral behaviour to the people, inevitably are drawn from the ranks of the bourgeoisie, and

since their mind has been developed in a propertied environment they are bound, with but few exceptions, to express unconsciously, and often with the sincere conviction that they are being "impartial," the point of view and the "egoism" of the bourgeoisie. We may sum up accordingly by saying that the wealthy class have control over public opinion through the natural effect of the social environment on the minds of people; through the schools; through the Churches; through the Universities; and through the publishing house and the Press.

The control which the capitalist class are able to exercise, by virtue of their economic power over Parliamentary legislation, can best be shown by two instances. In 1919 Lord Emmott resigned from a certain Government Committee because he declared that it had been packed in the interests of certain trades. We will let Lord Emmott tell one incident of this in his own words. Writing in "*Ways and Means*" some little time previous to this, he said:—

"A Cabinet meeting was appointed presided over by Sir Auckland Geddes to deal with the removal of restrictions on trade. I was a member of it. One day this Committee decided that . . . the people benefitted by cheap paper were more numerous and more important than the few thousands who were interested in the manufacture of paper. The moment steps were taken to give effect to this decision the manufacturers rose up in arms, and the Board of Trade quailed and with Sir A. Geddes' assent capitulated."

It may be said that this was willing capitulation. But this was not the case with the Moderate Socialist Government in Austria soon after the war. As soon as it broached some limited schemes of nationalisation of vital services, the capitalists threatened to close down their works unless the Government gave a promise that the measures would not be contemplated. The Government, faced with the economic paralysis of the country, was forced to yield and to abandon its mild socialistic measures. That this is no mere isolated case is seen by the similar experience of the Kerenski Moderate Socialist Government in Russia. Its weakness was due not merely to the presence of Liberals in the Government, but to the blackmail of the large capitalists and the financiers. In their hands Kerenski was impotent. The case of the Labour Minister of Queensland, Mr. Theodore, and the refusal of a loan to his government by London financiers, because he had taxed vested interests in Australia, is familiar. The fact that in U.S.A. the legislatures are in many cases completely the puppets of the Trusts is fully admitted even by bourgeois political scientists. Only they treat it as an "exception," whereas it is an exaggerated case of an universal phenomenon. The phenomenon can be summed up in abstract terms as follows:—The capitalists control the means of life of the community and therefore control the community; they dominate the vital credit, without which no government can exist a week, and hence dominate all governments.

It is very similar with the control which the capitalist class exercise over the executive and the judicature. It has been said that a Minister is powerless if his department is opposed to him. The State departments have almost absolute power over the carrying into effect of legislation, and the personnel of these departments

are inevitably drawn from the ranks of the bourgeoisie, often from the Public Schools and Universities, and therefore represent the bourgeois point of view. It is the same with the personnel of the legal profession. And it is a well-known historical fact that the legislation passed to restrain the employers at the beginning of last century, e.g., Whitfield's Act, were dead letters, because the magistrates who administered them were all conservative country gentry. Safeguards have been imposed in some States in America which ensure that no Socialist shall in future practise at the Bar. Such a provision might easily be introduced in England to make the judicature safe for the Plutocracy, if a Socialist Government really began to endanger the supremacy of the capitalist class. It is not, therefore, necessary to show that the capitalist class would be consciously dishonest in resisting Socialism. It is merely that their natural instincts, of what is right, offer an insuperable barrier to the execution of revolutionary measures, so long as the composition of the State remains what it is at present.

The Communist will show this graphically by imagining a Socialist Government in power and by picturing the insuperable obstacles with which it would have to contend. Such a Government, even supposing that it had obtained a majority in the country in spite of capitalist dictatorship of public opinion, and had obtained it on the definite issue of socialisation, and not on any momentary wave of emotional enthusiasm or by some "stunt" catch-phrase—a very optimistic assumption—would be powerless, politically, because it would find the whole power of the Capitalist autocracy up against it; all the influence of the £4,000,000,000 represented in the Federation of British Industries ranged against it, blackmailing it, bludgeoning it, undermining its popular support through intensive Press propaganda, crying out that it was ruining the country and striking a blow at the British Empire, and by using capitalist and financial "direct blow" to "sabotage" any scheme which threatened the supremacy of the Capitalist class. Psychology shows us the great strength of the "partial-herd-complex," and the strong "class-complex" of the bourgeoisie would be roused into violent opposition to proletarian legislation in every sphere of society.

A brief examination of the imaginary case cannot fail to show us that there is much strength in this contention. A Socialist Government in Parliament, even supposing it had swept away the opposition of the Lords completely, would find the executive departments, through which it sought to carry out its legislation firmly "class-conscious" and dominated by the Plutocracy. It would find the judiciary, on whom it relied to "interpret" and enforce its laws, firmly "class-conscious" and a mere instrument of the Plutocracy, and therefore . . . against it. (Who can imagine the present Judges of the King's Bench or the Lord Chancellor enforcing Bolshevik legislation? Who that is familiar with the history of Trade Union legislation is not well acquainted with the power that Judges of reactionary mentality have of quite honestly misinterpreting the law?) It would find the army and navy and police, on which it relied to suppress opposition to its decrees, commanded by bourgeois officers . . . against it. (Forsooth, if

officers in 1913 refused to carry out the orders of Mr. Asquith's Government, how much more would they refuse to enforce the revolutionary decrees of a Socialist Government, directed against their own class?) It would find itself blackmailed by the bankers and financiers, on whom it depended for loans and credit, as was Kerenski in Russia, and would have the colossal power of Throgmorton Avenue against it. (Even Sir Oswald Stoll has been complaining in the pages of "*The Daily Telegraph*" and in a new book that the big bankers hold Governments in the hollow of their hands!) It would find its every action misinterpreted and howled at in the Capitalist Press. To hope that the Socialists, with meagre funds, would be able to compete in propaganda with the capitalist millions is idle. Did not Mr. Lloyd George complain that with the Northcliffe Press rampant at home it was an impossibility to pursue even a comparatively "sane" foreign policy?

In fact, a Socialist Government in such a position would be forced either to compromise with Capitalism, or else it would have to call to its aid the *direct action of the proletariat* to counteract the opposition of the capitalists, and this to be successful would have to involve the seizure of the workshops by the workers—a self admission of the bankruptcy of Parliamentary Government. It would have to depend on its own specially organised Might to suppress the "sabotage" of capitalists and the mutiny of "White" officers and regulars. It would have to overhaul ruthlessly, and in many cases "scrap," existing State Departments, of which the personnel was hostile. It would have to suppress obnoxious capitalist journals (shades of Ramsay MacDonald and Ethel Snowden!), and control the banks. In short, *it would be compelled by the force of sheer circumstances to overthrow the Bourgeois Dictatorship by the inauguration of the Proletarian Dictatorship.*

But it is highly improbable, the Communist asserts, that this advanced stage in the political arena will be reached, before a crisis in the class-struggle is reached in the industrial sphere, creating an insurmountable "impasse." Firstly, it is extremely unlikely that the class-consciousness of the workers will be organised as fully in the political sphere as it is in the industrial sphere, i.e., in the workshops (c.f., the argument cited on Page 287, Section (iii)); especially in view of the capitalist control over political opinion, to which reference has recently been made. On the contrary, it is probable that long before this a revolutionary conflict would be joined all along the line in industry between the workers and the capitalists, as might have happened in Italy in 1920 if the metal workers' seizure of the factories had been extended to other industries; or as might have occurred in England in April, 1921, if the threatened General Strike of the Triple Alliance had materialised, and the capitalists had refused to compromise.

Secondly, it is highly probable that before a Socialist Government comes into power, or, at any rate, before it can carry through Socialist legislation, the bourgeoisie will resort to extra-constitutional action, to nullify Parliamentary action and to suppress the proletarian movement. It is scarcely to be doubted that a class responsible for the illegal Terror of the Black and Tans in Ireland, for the secret plots to smash Trade Unionism in the Railway Strike

of 1919, and the Coal Lock-out of 1921, will take action of this kind, when the whole supremacy as a class is at stake. It was done in Russia with the White Guard. It was attempted in Germany in 1920, when only a General Strike frustrated the Kapp military "Putsch." It is being done in Italy with the Fascisti, who terrorise the workers, and often prevent Socialists going to the polls. It is common in U.S.A., as was well shown in last month's *Review*, in the article on "The American Legion," and in authenticated books of such writers as Upton Sinclair.

It is therefore probable that all that Reformist Parliamentary action will achieve will be, at the most, the election of a Labour Government of the J. H. Thomas type, which will be weak and compromising, will achieve little, and may actually come into direct conflict with the rank and file of the workers in the workshops, as has the Majority Socialist Government in Germany. As R. Palme Dutt sums it up:—

"The whole of experience so far is on the side of the Communist, and not an atom of experience is on the other side. In every country so far the crisis of the class struggle has either preceded any parliamentary majority (this is the commonest type); or else, where a majority has been achieved, that majority has either been of the diluted "labourist" type, which leaves the class struggle unaffected (as in Australia or Sweden), or where it has been a genuine Socialist majority trying to carry out a Socialist programme by constitutional means (the only example of this so far is Finland, but an analogy may be found in Ireland) the bourgeoisie has speedily stepped in to break the constitution and crush the movement."*

But as a matter of fact the Communist does not only affirm this Reformist Parliamentary method to be futile; he declares it to possess considerable dangers. The inevitable tendency, as we have already seen, of the Parliamentarian engrossed in a Parliamentary struggle, and often making a career out of it, is to exaggerate the importance of the particular method which he is adopting and of the particular little fragmentary reforms for which he is striving in the immediate present. This tendency is plainly visible to-day, when not only the J. H. Thomases and the Clynes but even the I.L.P. are seeking to persuade the workers that industrial activity is only secondary to Parliamentary action. This is to court disaster for the Labour movement.

Moreover, the Reformist Socialists, as we saw at the outset, do not regard the subjection of the proletariat as anything much more than a "descriptive fact" for the sake of argument. The root evils which absorb their attention are monopoly and "laissez-faire"; their remedy is State ownership. The Fabian method of asking 2d. in order to get 1d., which means constant compromise, is their political ideal. Their method of gaining this necessitates the persuasion of a considerable number of the bourgeoisie, which again inevitably means compromise to catch votes. In other words they must give a "quid pro quo" to the bourgeoisie for every point they gain. What is this "quid pro quo" to be? As Hilaire Belloc showed before the war, it has so far been legal restrictions on the worker. In 1920 the German

(*) *University Socialist Federation Bulletin*, May, 1921.

Government proposed to socialise the mines. The existing capitalists said that they would only consent to this if they were employed as Managing Directors at high salaries, nearly equivalent to their former profits, and if conscription of labour and the right to strike were disallowed. Information goes to show that the German Government was willing to accept this compromise. Now even this has been abandoned owing to the growing power of Stinnes, with whom the Government has had to compromise all along the line. This tendency is inevitably lurking in Reformist compromise, a tendency towards what Belloc termed the "Servile State," a sort of capitalist serfdom, where the status of the worker is fixed in the State plan, and his freedom to strike against capitalism annulled. Whether they know it or not, this is the condition of affairs which must inevitably arise from the policy advocated by Messrs. J. H. Thomas and Ramsay MacDonald.

IV.

The Way Out

WHAT, then, is the Communist's method, what is his aim? He asserts that the person who conceives of the growth of Capitalism into Socialism as an "organic" growth, the one "broadening out" into the other, as the "collective will" of the community expressed in the State slowly and gradually changes, is blind to the true nature of the present system. He is supposing an organic solidarity in society which does not exist. He is neglecting the obvious fact—i.e., obvious to the class-conscious proletariat—of the class struggle. Since there are two distinct and antithetical "wills" in society, the one directed to the preservation at all costs of the "coercive association" of labour and the dominance of the bourgeoisie, the other directed at all costs to the ending of the dominance of the bourgeoisie, and with it the dissolution of the "coercive association."

Now, if, as has been already asserted, the capitalist class obtain their power to control society from their possession of wealth, i.e., their ownership of industry and land, then that power can only be ended and transferred to the hands of the working class by the transference of land and industry from the hands of the comparatively few capitalists to the proletariat organised as a class. If, as has been stated above, this cannot be done through Parliament, it must be done by direct proletarian action. And the instrument by which the proletariat can do this, and carry on the control of society, must be by special institutions which represent the masses as producers and distributors of wealth. These in Russia were called Soviets. It is the fact that capitalist control of society is based on force that necessitates the use of force by the proletariat to dispossess them. The force used by the Capitalist Dictatorship to buttress its power will be the measure of the force necessary to defeat it. The Communist method does not involve any more force than the I.L.P. method would, supposing it to be anything than futile. *Force is the attribute of any attaining to power by whatever method, if there is opposition to its attainment.* Circumstances impose the necessity of force, not any particular method.

When, then, of the morrow of the Revolution? What further necessity is there for restriction of freedom? Why should not the millenium be ushered in at once? These are questions often put by anti-Communists. The Communist replies thus. The control of industry, and hence of society, having passed from the directing will of the bourgeoisie to the directing will of the proletariat, a move has been made towards the removal of class antagonisms by the removal of the economic cause producing them—private ownership of industry with its necessary corollary—the subjection of the non-owning class. But this tendency can only be maintained if the will of the proletariat continues to direct and dominate. Just as previously the bourgeoisie found it necessary to use the State to suppress the “egoism” of the proletariat, whose interference in the direction of affairs would have challenged the whole basis of capitalist society: so after the revolution the proletariat must use the State to suppress the “egoism” or “will” of the bourgeoisie, whose natural aim is to reverse the move towards Communism and to restore their own privileges. Since the two egoisms are antithetical there must be a struggle between them. One must be dominant to the subjection of the other. This is the meaning of the Proletarian Dictatorship of the Proletarian State. It is a Dictatorship in the sense that the State has always been in history the organ of class-power.

Where, then, the middle-class Socialist will ask, is there any improvement on the present system? What guarantee is there that this Dictatorship will not be perpetual and not merely temporal? The Communist will reply that this question arises from loose thinking; the questioner is blinded by the appearance of things on the surface to the nature of underlying causes. The egoism of the bourgeoisie arises from a particular type of mind, and this type of mind will not disappear in a night. So long as this type of mind persists, therefore, the Proletarian State must exercise its dictatorship to prevent this type of mind from interfering in the control of affairs. Otherwise all might well be confusion and vacillation from one extreme to the other. But how did this bourgeois type of mind originate in the first place? It originated as the result of a certain social environment, which in its turn depended upon a certain relation—the relation of ownership—to the economic environment. With the ending of private ownership this particular economic relationship ceases; and with it gradually ceases the creation of a bourgeois type of mind. Instead the new environment, which is gradually being reconstructed in the direction of Communism, creates a type of mind that is neither proletarian nor bourgeois, but progressively more communist, having a common collective will—the efficiency of the new form of production. It is this new type of mind, which makes the free association of labour and complete Communism possible. As class differences disappear with the rising generation reared in the new environment, and the bourgeois type of mind ceases to oppose a contrary egoism to the establishment of Communism, so will the need for Dictatorship disappear, and there being nothing over which this dictatorship is to be exercised there will automatically cease to be any dictatorship. This is what Engel's meant when he spoke about the State “withering away.”

Moreover, the complete expropriation of the bourgeoisie will not take place all at once. The initial stages will have been accomplished by the seizure of industry by the workers. But there will still remain much to be done in the way of vesting the means of production in the community. Moreover, the time immediately following the Revolution is likely to be full of bourgeois plots and "sabotage," and attempted counter-revolutionary risings. The State must be armed with powers to suppress these, or the result will be chaos. Nor should we overlook the influence of the world revolutionary situation. A proletarian Dictatorship must mould its policy in accordance with the power, not of the home capitalist class, but of the imperialist propertied interests of the world.

But what guarantee is there that the leaders of the proletariat, in whom this supreme power is temporarily vested, will not continue to act as dictators permanently, as Bertrand Russell prophesies? Brailsford gives a partial answer in the case of Russia, when he says because they are educating the people. The complete answer is that the leaders have no power except that which they derive from the proletariat, and this is meant in a real and not merely a legal sense. Even supposing them not to be elected by the workers through the Soviets, they only have power in so far as they express the collective will of the proletariat. What other power, the Communist will ask in reply, have they? They are not owners of private accumulations of wealth, which can enable them to enslave non-owners, as under the property system. Their psychology is proletarian, and therefore is not likely to produce anti-proletarian desires in the mass of them; for as we have already seen, the "herd-complex" is strong. (The case of the Trade Union leader is no analogy, in that it is *bourgeois* environment and contact with *bourgeois* minds which infects him.) The leaders would have to form a separate caste apart for a generation before in any sense there would be the likelihood of them developing into a separate class with fundamental desires different to those of the masses. But even supposing the impossible, that all persons in State positions concocted a plot to amass wealth to themselves and exploit the rest of the community; the proletariat, their class-consciousness now having been fully organised by the Revolution, would have less difficulty in removing them than they had in removing the capitalists. As a matter of fact, long before the leaders amassed sufficient economic power in their hands as to make them personal dictators, the proletariat would have displaced them as easily as to-day society removes a burglary-gang. They would do this the first time the leaders acted seriously contrary to their collective egoism. As a matter of fact in Russia there is abundant proof that with the lightening of the stress of civil war and imperialist invasion the restrictions are being everywhere relaxed, and non-party representatives are more and more being admitted into the administration.

There seems little fear, therefore, that the Dictatorship, which is temporarily exercised over the bourgeoisie, will fail to be purely transitional. The very seeds sown by this Dictatorship, in the shape of economic changes, will finally reach that system where the "government of men" will be "replaced by the administration of things." Then mankind will be ready for a further stage of evolu-

tion on a higher plane. Such is the Communist's assertion of the inevitability of his ultimate ideal.

To dissipate a misapprehension on one or two important questions, it is necessary to correct a somewhat common misunderstanding. The first can be corrected by quoting a definition.

Dictatorship : an extraordinary power for a particular purpose.

Proletariat : the workers regarded as in conflict with the capitalist—therefore containing potentially all workers including the managerial, but actually according to their alignment in the class struggle.”*

This definition shows that “Proletariat” does not only include manual workers as is so often supposed. It merely happens that by virtue of their economic position the manual workers are the first to become class-conscious as a rule. In Russia doctors and teachers are equally represented in the Soviets with factory workers. The Manifesto of the Third (Moscow) Communist International leaves no doubt on this point. It says:—

“All qualified technicians and specialists are to be made use of, provided that . . . they are capable of adapting themselves, not to the service of capital, but to the new system of production. Far from oppressing them the proletariat will make it possible for the first time for them to develop intensive creative work. The Proletarian Dictatorship *with their co-operation* will reverse the separation of physical and mental work, which capitalism has developed, and *thus will Science and Labour be unified.*”

Secondly, the mass action of the proletariat does not mean mob rule; it does not mean the blind violence of the slum proletariat. “The slum proletariat,” says Postgate, “may make a riot but not a revolution. . . . The ideals on which Socialism rests have no meaning for a degraded mind. It will vote for Horatio Bottomley every time.” Lenin has said that the Revolutionary Dictatorship must as sternly repress the looting and disorder of the hooligan element as it represses the intrigues of the bourgeoisie. The mass action of the proletariat means the disciplined action of the organised workers, led by Communist mass fighters and assisted by all who have become imbued with proletarian ideology. The more disciplined the proletariat are through their revolutionary organisations, the more conscious and powerful they are, and the less destructive and the more peaceful will a revolution be. Hence the insistence of the Communist on organising *now* for such revolutionary crisis as may arise in the future, so that the proletariat shall not be “caught napping.”

In conclusion, the idealism of Communists is well expressed in the following fine passage in the Manifesto of the Third International:—

“Their would be no civil war, if the exploiters, who have carried mankind to the brink of ruin, had not prevented every step of the labouring masses, if they had not instigated plots and murders and called to their aid armed help to maintain or restore their predatory privileges. Civil War is forced upon the labouring classes by their arch-enemies.

“The Communist parties, far from conjuring up civil war artificially, strive to shorten its duration as much as possible—in case it has

(*) R. Palme Dutt in *The Guildsman*, Oct., 1919, quoted by Postgate.

become an iron necessity—to minimise the number of its victims and to secure victory for the proletariat.

“The ultimate result of the capitalist mode of production is chaos—a chaos to be overcome only by the great producing class, the proletariat, which must establish real order, the order of Communism. It must end the domination of capital, make war impossible, and transform the world into one co-operative commonwealth, and bring about real human brotherhood and freedom.”

Bibliography

Useful expositions of the Marxian Historical theory are contained in:—

The State: its Origin and Function, by William Paul (3/6). This volume, which went through three editions, is now out of print. It has been re-written and will be published shortly.

The Theoretical System of Karl Marx, by Louis Boudin (Kerr & Co., Chicago, \$1.25).

Essays on the Materialist Conception of History, by Professor Antonio Labriola (Kerr & Co., Chicago, \$1.25).

Ethics and the Materialist Conception of History, by Karl Kautsky (Kerr & Co., Chicago, 60 cents).

The Class Struggle, by Karl Kautsky (Kerr & Co., 60 cents).

Economics as the Basis of Living Ethics, by Professor J. G. Murdoch (Constable & Co., 8/6).

The following are biographies of Marx:—

Karl Marx, by Professor Achille Loria (George Allen & Unwin, 3/6).

Karl Marx: the Man and his Work, by Karl Dannenburg (Radical Review Publishing Association, New York, 30 cents).

The Life and Teaching of Marx, by Max Beer (National Labour Press, 3/6).

The application of Marxism to actual historical facts is well presented in:—

In Defence of Terrorism, by Trotsky. 3/6. Labour Publishing Co. This is a shattering reply to the democratic pleas of Kautsky and MacDonald.

A Worker Looks at History, by Mark Starr (Plebs League, 2/6).

Economic Foundations of Society, by Professor Achille Loria (George Allen & Unwin, 3/6).

Economic Causes of War, by Professor Achille Loria (Kerr & Co., Chicago, \$1.)

Class Struggles in America, by A. M. Simon (Kerr & Co., Chicago, 60 cents).

Revolution: from 1789-1906, by R. W. Postgate (Grant Richards, 18/-).

The latter of these is a valuable documentary survey of the proletarian movements of the last century in Europe. In the case of Loria's work allowance must be made for the fact that he has too great a fondness for the "cut and dried" formulas, and his Marxism is in places not strictly orthodox. But his manner of treatment is very masterly. The bourgeois conception of the State and its growth and of the Constitution is well expressed in:—

The State, by Woodrow Wilson,

The Law of the Constitution, and

Law and Opinion, by Professor Sir A. V. Dicey.

Another view of the State and of society—the centrist-Guildsman's view is given in a very excellent and thought-provoking book:—

Social Theory, by G. D. H. Cole (Cassell, 5/-).

Socialism and Positive Science, by Professor Enrico Ferri (Independent Labour Party (2/6)

deals with Marxism from the point of view of the Darwinian and is useful.

Historical Materialism and the Economics of Karl Marx, by Benedetto Croce, discusses some interesting questions in connection with Marxism and propounds an interesting "via media" defending Marxism as an historical method but rejecting it as a complete explanation of history.

Criticisms of Marxism are to be found in:—

- The Economic Interpretation of History*, by Professor Seligman.
A Guildsman's Interpretation of History, by A. J. Penty.
Karl Marx and Modern Socialism, by F. R. Salter (Macmillan & Co., 6/-).
Evolutionary Socialism, by E. Bernstein (Independent Labour Party, 2/6).
The Revival of Marxism, by Professor J. S. Nicholson (John Murray, 6/-).

Of these, Seligman's is the best. Nicholson's is very superficial and rather silly—on the whole distinctly unworthy of a fairly distinguished economist.

The Reformist method is outlined as opposed to the Communist method in:—

- The Fabian Essays* (first published 1888. Fabian Society, 2/-).
Socialism and Society, by J. Ramsay Macdonald (Independent Labour Party, 2/6).
Parliament or Revolution, by J. Ramsay Macdonald (National Labour Press, 3/-).
Parliament and Democracy, by J. Ramsay Macdonald (National Labour Press, 3/6).
The March towards Socialism, by E. Milhaud (Leonard Parsons, 8/6).
The Dictatorship of the Proletariat, by Karl Kautsky.
Terrorism and Communism, by Karl Kautsky (National Labour Press, 6/-).

Of these, the Fabian Essays are far and away the best exposition of the Reformist conception, and Milhaud's book is the best elucidation of the Reformist method yet published. The ordinary "democratic" objections to Communism are best summed up in Kautsky's *Dictatorship*.

Criticisms of Communism in Russia are also to be found in some chapters of:—

- The Evolution of Revolution*, by H. M. Hyndman (Grant Richards, 21/-).
Bolshevism, by John Spargo.
National Guilds, by M. B. Reckitt and C. E. Bechoffer.
The Practice and Theory of Bolshevism, by Bertrand Russell (George Allen & Unwin, 6/-).
Through Bolshevik Russia, by Mrs. P. Snowden (Cassell's).

Of these it is difficult to say which is the best criticism. B. Russell's is the best written. Mrs. Snowden's is so spitefully partisan that in parts it becomes stupidly slanderous.

The following are expositions of the Communist point of view:—

- The Bolshevik Theory*, by R. W. Postgate (Grant Richards, 7/6).
Creative Revolution, by Eden and Cedar Paul (George Allen & Unwin, 8/6, and Plebs League, 3/6).
The State and Revolution, by N. Lenin (Communist Party, 1/6).
The World Revolution, by Dr. Herman Gorter (Socialist Information and Research Bureau, Scotland, 1/-).
Direct Action, by William Mellor (Leonard Parsons, 4/6).
The New Labour Outlook, by Robert Williams (Leonard Parsons, 4/6).
The Economics of Proletarian Dictatorship, by Professor Eugene Varga (to be translated).

Forthcoming volumes which should prove most interesting are:—

- A.B.C. of Communism*, by Bucharin and Preobrazhensky.
Communism and Society, by Wm. Paul.

The Syndicalist and Industrial Unionist position, which in part underlies the more recent theories of Communism, is summed up well in:—

- Reflections on Violence*, by G. Sorel (George Allen & Unwin, 8/6).
Reform or Revolution, by Karl Dannenburg (Radical Review Publishing Association, 10 cents).

and in numerous pamphlets by Daniel de Leon and others, published before and during the war by the Socialist Labour Party.

Russian Women at Work

Two Brief Interviews with Russian Women Officials

By HENRIETTA ROLAND HOLST

1.

The Political Commissar of the Red Army

A SLIGHT woman, still young, with a rather long, thin face, not pretty, but with an intelligent, alive look in her face, her dark hair carefully waved, wearing her smart summer snow-white uniform with its red facings, and dark blue cloth skirt, with a certain air of coquetry.

"Top boots are part of the uniform," said the young woman, "but fortunately we are only obliged to wear them at the front, for they are very heavy."

"What exactly are you, Comrade? What work do you do?" I asked.

"My rank is almost that of a general," she replied, laughingly, and in her laugh there sounded both self-assurance and pride. "I am Political Commissar to the Brigadier-General. He must not take any decision without asking my advice, and I am responsible for his not doing anything that might compromise the Soviet Republic."

Such an answer, like a dazzling flash, shows vividly the distance that divides Soviet Russia from the rest of Europe. For a civilian, for a woman to control a general, to have the power of putting a stop to the carrying out of his decisions; what a breakdown here of old traditions and customs, what a tearing-up of deeply-rooted conceptions, and what an insight we find here of the awakening power of women! But the Woman Kommissar went on to talk about her work at the front among the soldiers.

"I am also entrusted with the carrying on of political propaganda in the Red Army, and this is the work I prefer, because one sees the results! A short time ago I was agitating here in Moscow among women working in the factories, and I enjoy work among women; besides, such a change of work keeps one fresh." Then we chatted about the women who serve as soldiers in the Red Army.

"There have been many exaggerated accounts of these women soldiers," said our comrade. "There are very few women now at the front, the work was too hard. Yes, naturally, when the Republic was in great danger, when Yudenitch was at the gates of Petrograd, that was a different matter. Then many women who had learnt to bear arms fought in the front ranks of the Communists."

She has a brave and generous nature this your Commissar; no overwrought feminist with foolish, wild ideas of "absolute equality" of the sexes, but a capable, sensible, clever woman.

II.

The Inspector of the Children's Colonies

DURING these summer months one can often see in the Province of Moscow a fine large Government motor car tearing along the rough paved roads, or ploughing its way through the white sand of the birch tree avenues. In the car there is sitting, often alone, but sometimes accompanied by women comrades from other countries, who are interested in her work, a small, slightly-built woman with a delicate overtired expression on her face. She wears a long grey linen dust cloak and a white linen hat with a widow's veil. This is Comrade Kalinina, the Inspector of the Children's Homes in the neighbourhood of Moscow.

She travels about daily inspecting the Colonies, some of which lie at a distance of half a day's journey in the forests around Moscow. . . . Comrade Kalinina insists on seeing everything for herself, and on obtaining first hand information that everything is in order. This may appear very simple; but it is not so when one thinks how few know their way all over Moscow, just as how few there are who know their way all over Berlin, or London, or Paris. She has therefore to ask and to ask again, and yet again the way to a certain People's House, or Summer Theatre, the meeting place for the children of a certain quarter. And in the case of the excursions into the country, it is also constantly very difficult to find a special village or colony. . . .

Comrade Kalinina loves her work, and above all loves the children. And, what is difficult to believe, she is not only interested in them in the mass, but shows also a personal interest in them individually. More than 40,000 children are being brought up in the Summer Colonies in the Government of Moscow. One would think it would not be possible for Comrade Kalinina to deal with such a number in any other way than as in the mass, and yet it is not so at all. In both the Colonies that I visited with her I noticed how the children ran to meet her, and kissed and embraced her with joy. One could not help noticing that there was a personal link between her and the children. The very little ones made a special appeal to Comrade Kalinina, and when she occasionally spoke of the character or the history of one or other of the children, a look of motherly tenderness came into her face, and softened the sharp, weary features.

It is towards the most unhappy and neglected children that our Comrade feels most drawn. One realises this in everything; in her voice, her eyes, the expression of her face, that her greatest happiness is to care for them; to assure herself that those little ones who, during their early years have suffered so terribly, may now be sheltered and nurtured with every possible loving care.

"I should like so much to see the Children's Model Village, 'Dietski Gorod,'" I said one day to Comrade Kalinina. "Can you not take me there?"

“Of course,” she answered, “but that is a ‘democratic’ colony; the children brought up there belong for the most part to the Soviet employees and persons of that description. On Sunday I am going to inspect a colony composed almost entirely of proletarian children, orphans and neglected children, the victims of the war, and of the counter-revolution. I would much rather show you this colony, even though it is not a model colony.”

Another time I accompanied Comrade Kalinina on her tour of inspection of the *Conservatoire* in the forest, where about eighty children are being trained in the Arts of Music and the Theatre. The pupils danced, sang and played for us, and it was touching to watch Kalinina's face, how she watched our slightest change of expression, and seemed to ask us with her eyes whether we were pleased; and to notice how she beamed with pleasure when she read in our faces our astonishment and delight. One pupil was her special favourite, a big, strong girl of fourteen, with a very Russian cast of countenance—high cheek-bones, full lips, and a flat nose. She had a fine, deep voice, and seemed to possess musical and dramatic gifts. Comrade Kalinina told us how this child had been rescued a few years back from the streets, where her mother was a prostitute, and where the precocious talented young creature was in danger. To-day the memory of the misery and neglect of the past was daily receding further and further from her mind. In the pure atmosphere of love and beauty, in these immense forests, the new being was developing.

To watch Comrade Kalinina kissing and caressing this young girl, holding her arm, and talking to her like a mother with a growing daughter—this was more delightful to watch than the singing and the dancing of the other children. It was a symbol of the new motherhood, whose expression is not bounded by the child or the children of one's own flesh and blood, born of one's own body, but which pours out in love and in friendliness to all children with whom it comes in contact, cherishes and cares for them all, from an inexhaustible store of strength, and thus finds happiness.

[From *The Kommunistische Fraueninternationale*. Translated by Dora B. Montefiore.]

BACK NUMBERS OF THE “Communist Review”

Those who are anxious to make up a complete set of the
“Communist Review”

may obtain some of the back numbers, price 8d. each,
post free, by sending their order to:—

16, King Street,
Covent Garden,
London, W.C. 2

The International of Money Bags

By J. T. WALTON NEWBOLD

[In the following article Comrade Newbold continues his revelations regarding the operation of international finance-capital. By studying these articles carefully we are able to unravel the reason why the Premiers and statesmen of the large capitalist States require to meet in secret conferences to settle "important international problems." The nature of these problems may be understood when we see the names of the expert financial advisers who accompany the various statesmen upon their trips to Cannes, etc. It is the financial advisers who *dictate* the policy of the statesmen of the "democratic" States. Here, again, we notice the correctness of the policy of the Communist International, which is based upon the recognition of the power wielded by a minority of plutocratic dictators over the so-called democratic governments of the world.—Editor, COMMUNIST REVIEW.]

I.

From Motherwell to Mülheim*

SOME few weeks ago there returned from Germany, where he had been observing the commercial and industrial situation, a gentleman of the name of Andreae. He is not a figure very well known to the general public, even that section of it which follows fairly closely the world of stocks and shares, of debits and credits. That does not, however, mean that he is not a person of some consequence in the sphere of finance capital. There are many gentlemen in the realms of money trading, with whose credulity and operations the working class and their industrial and political leaders are all too little aware. The individual in question was in the nature of a pioneer in the re-discovery of Germany as a country whose trade and manufactures it was eminently desirable to revive. He was a harbinger of that new evangel of friendly co-operation with Germany—with the capitalists of Germany—which has now become the fashionable cult in the best circles in the City. There are two gentlemen of the name of Andreae in the *Directory of Directors* for 1921. The first is E. P. Andreae, a director of the *Russo-Asiatic Consolidated, Ltd.*, whereof Leslie Urquhart is chairman. The second is Hermann Anton Andreae, one of the three partners in a firm of merchant bankers of the name of *Kleinwort, Sons and Co.* It was the latter who was scouting around in what would seem to be the land of his fathers. Whence, precisely, he came—he and his clan—we know not, but there was a firm of merchant bankers in Frankfurt-on-Main some years ago called Andreae, and there is an F. Andreae on the directorate of the *Reichsbank*, and a J. Andreae on that of the *Bank für Handel und Industrie* of Darmstadt. It is not exactly an English sounding name.

Messrs. Kleinwort, Sons and Co. are already represented in the *Anglo-Danubian Association, Ltd.*, one of the recent creations

* Mülheim is the headquarters of Hugo Stinnes.

having in view the commercial development of Central and Eastern Europe. They are now, evidently, interesting themselves in another European "coolie plantation," the German Empire (or is it a "Socialist" Republic?). Their operations are the more interesting by reason of the fact that two gentlemen who sign for them, by what the lawyers call "procuration" in London, hold 5,000 £1 Preference and 14,408,562 1/- Ordinary shares—much the largest holding—in the *Northumberland Shipbuilding Co., Ltd.* This concern owns, or controls, the following concerns—some of them slowing down, some closing down, and some of which have long since closed down:—

Wm. Doxford & Sons, Ltd., Shipbuilders, Sunderland.
 Fairfield Shipbuilding and Engineering Co., Ltd., Govan.
 Monmouth Shipbuilding Co., Ltd., Chepstow.
 Workman, Clark & Co., Ltd., Belfast.
 The Lanarkshire Steel Co., Ltd., Motherwell.
 John Watsons, Ltd., Coal Owners, Lanarkshire.

The Ordinary shares of the Northumberland Company, nominally worth 1/-, are now offering at 6½d. or 7d. They and their employees have been struck with devastating force by the policy of Reparations in German cargo-steamers.

Sir E. M. Edgar, a director of all these companies above named, as being in association with the Northumberland Company, owner of the "Saturday Review," and earnest advocate of an economic *entente* with Germany, laid it down in "Sperling's Magazine" for June, that conditions in the coal industry could only be restored as follows:—

- (i.) The pit-head price of coal must be brought down to £1 per ton.
- (ii.) Lower wages, longer hours, fewer men and increased output.
- (iii.) These conditions can only be secured if the coal industry is run on a free labour basis, or if the trade unions make a clean break with their ca' canny practices.

Sperling and Co. are interested, also, in the Russo-Asiatic Consolidated, Ltd., and McKay Edgar is one of the directors. Last week the *Financial Times* informed us that *Krupp*, of Essen—the All Highest yet unchanged—used to be the second shareholder there, and *Mendelssohns* have acquired a shareholding in the Russo-Asiatic Consolidated. *Mendelssohns* are not musicians, but "the well-known bankers" of Frankfurt. *Krupps* have been making, since the war, a speciality of locomotive construction and the building of railway wagons and carriages. They are, also, very big coal owners.

II.

The Rising of Revisionism

THERE is much talk of the desirability of the German Government pledging, i.e., mortgaging, all its railways, canals, telegraphs and other public utilities to the big German industrialists, like *Stinnes*, *Krupp*, *Thyssen*, etc., and to the German great banks, who, in turn, should mortgage them to the British and other Allied capitalists.

Public utilities in Germany have been running at a loss, and assisted by heavy government subsidies to enable the German industrialists to transport their commodities at low competitive rates and undercut the capitalists of other countries. The German Government has borrowed money from the banks and industrialists to pay the subsidies and make good the losses. Now that the German Government is threatening to tax these capitalists to pay the interest and pay back the principal on their own loans, the latter are, in chorus with MacKay Edgar and other British specialists in company promoting, proclaiming the bankruptcy of State enterprise and the failure of "socialistic" experiments. The creditors of the German Government will not be taxed to pay themselves. Instead, they demand the forfeiture to them of the debt-ridden properties of the Government. Nowhere outside of the "ring" of money-lenders, the International of Money Bags, can the debtor Government look for financial aid.

This is the inevitable doom of the vaunted "collectivism" of the Webbs, Snowdens, Vanderveldes, and Wallheads, to be broken on the reefs of financial dictatorship submerged beneath the smiling and treacherous surface of "democratic government." Thus must the "practical" politics of the social-pacifists and the vote-catching illusionists drift to the certain shipwreck of a hollow statecraft.

The futility of "statism" and municipalism without the conquest of economic power is being revealed to the uttermost in Germany, as is that of "sane" trade unionism and "parliamentarism" in Britain.

The magnificent transport services and means of communication which have been the glory of Germany and the wonder of the world are now to fall into the clutches and under the domination of the bondholding and shareholding cliques of London, Paris, Brussels, Amsterdam and Frankfurt. These, the finest of all the material manifestations of capitalist investment, the most stable and enduring expressions of industrial achievement, the foundation necessities of the economy of the ever more rapid circulation of commodities, the actual tangible bases of capitalist commerce and civilisation, the TRANSPORT SYSTEMS OF EUROPE—*these* are the coveted prize of the creditors of Europe.

There will be haggling and bargaining, intrigue and competition within the councils and between the counting-houses of capitalism.

III.

The Collapse of the Steel Trades

BUT let it be remembered that the extended duration of the trade and industrial depression has put enormous economic power into the hands not only of the great joint stock banks, but of certain elements represented on the boards and in the control of those banks. The war-profiteers, the shipowning, coal-exporting, steel-making, engineering financiers have had to borrow money from these banks, have had to lose their own grip on these banks, have had to have recourse to the old-time masters of these banks, the merchant bankers, the money merchants. The depression was

engineered, was contrived, was aggravated by a financial interest that was losing its grip. This interest has largely succeeded in foreclosing upon its rivals. Clients have become entangled debtors whose businesses and plants have fallen to their creditors. Often, this state of affairs is not obvious at a glance, but, without hesitation, I say that it is the case and becoming more and more the case with every day that it passes.

The long-established, closely connected and not too numerous groupings of cosmopolitan financiers are coming into their own again. The intensive development of the metallurgical and chemical industries which was so marked a phenomenon of the war years, and of the period of acute rivalry in armaments preceding it, was effected on a very insecure and impermanent basis.

In 'How Europe Armed for War,' I showed the truly parasitical nature of the armament trades. They stimulated to an intense activity certain industries or phases of industries. They called for the embodiment in material form of an immensity of productive energy, as, for instance, gun and armour-plate, ship-plate and heavy forging plants at Sheffield, Elswick, Openshaw and Parkhead; shipyards at Clydebank, Govan, Wallsend, Jarrow, Walker, Barrow, Birkenhead; engine shops at Newcastle, Sunderland, Dalmuir, Stobcross, etc. They caused intermittently extravagant demands on the steel trades of Middlesbrough and Motherwell. When the War came and developed into one of shells and ships, machine-shops and shipyards sprung up, mushroom like, in every part of this and the combatant countries. Large scale and rapid production over a limited period placed immense volumes of surplus value in the hands of manufacturers, shipowners and insurance brokers. There appeared then the Furnesses, the Dalziels, the du Cros family, the MacAlpines, the Isaacs, the Ellermans, the Sperlings and their like in this and every country affected by the phenomenal production of wartime values. Their onrush was tremendous. Politically, they swept the Asquithians on one side and smashed the Liberal Party to match-wood. Economically, we saw their factories—brick, plate-glass and ferro-concrete by the mile, and interspersed with these, high piled dumps and endless lines of motor-chasses. The show was very brave—until the Armistice. Their owners (and managing owners) made millions upon millions of profits. These they turned to invest somewhere, anywhere, in everything. They bought socially unnecessary embodiments of labour power and have steadily found that their millions were all illusion. True, there ensued a great trade expansion in 1919 and up to the autumn of 1920. Certain trades had phenomenal outputs to market and immeasurable profits to re-invest. It is this problem of re-investment which has proved beyond their capacity to solve in a profitable manner. To-day, some shares have slumped terrifically, and only a trust in the future recovery of the market for an immense productivity of the broken millions of trade unionists maintains thousands more at their present insecure levels as readily marketable securities.

The years 1920 and 1921 have revealed not only the illusion of Armistice and Wartime prosperity, but the yet more terrible fact that the industrial plants on the Clyde, Tyne and at Sheffield,

Birmingham and in Manchester as well as the bloated steam coal export businesses of South Wales are far in excess of the requirements of the country that has "won the war to end war."

The German ships obtained by way of Reparations and the ships of the now derelict U.S. Shipping Board have brought about a state of affairs such that in October, November and December last, in *all* the shipyards of the United Kingdom, orders were received for only *two* new cargo steamers. Ten years or more ago, the shipbuilding industry absorbed between 30 per cent. and 40 per cent. of the British steel output, and to-day, there is not a single warship of any class on any slipway in Great Britain and Ireland, and 90 per cent. of the yards are working on their last orders for merchant ships. The industries of capitalist imperialism in Great Britain and Ireland are in grave and immediate danger of being reduced to the exchange value of scrap iron.

IV.

Get Out or Get Under!

IN France, the *Banque Industrielle de Chine*, a concern representative of industrial entrepreneurs in would-be successful revolt against the financial dictatorship of interlocked finance capital, has been allowed by the big banks to drift to disaster irreparable. Berthelot has had to depart from the position of permanent Secretary to the Ministry of Foreign Affairs and the would-be electrical financiers—as distinct from financiers exploiting electricity—have gone down to defeat.

In Italy has occurred, with deafening clatter, the collapse of the *Banca di Sconto*. The President is Signor Guglielmo Marconi, head of the *Marconi Wireless Company*. Seemingly, the *Banca Commerciale Italiana*, the *Banca d'Italia*, and the *Credito Italiano* have either failed to shore it up by means of their projected salvage consortium or have hesitated to involve themselves in the peril of a common ruin. Its *débâcle* was brought about by reason of its enormous losses in the floating of ventures on behalf of *Gio Arwaldo and Co.*, the mighty armament, shipbuilding and engineering syndicate of Genoa. The Perrone brothers, who had sought to elevate this concern into the Italian equivalent of Vickers, Ltd., have failed to realise the results which they too confidently expected. Apparently, a year ago, they tried unsuccessful conclusions with the dominant forces in the *Banca Commerciale Italiana*. Whether the *Societa di Terni* and the *F.I.A.T.* will follow the *Ilva Steel Company* to collapse remains to be seen. The whole fabric of Toepliz-Castiglioni speculations must be perilously poised in these days of closing bourses, sagging exchanges and state instituted *moratoria*. So far, we are assured, there are but slight reactions from the Italian catastrophe, but if it should spread its confusion amongst its allies, well, one of its associates is *Barclays Bank, Ltd.*

Italy has been an extensive buyer of South Wales coal, and we know that there are accounts with Swansea and Cardiff that are not yet settled. Barclays Bank, Ltd., entered South Wales to participate in the finance of the coal export trade. It must be distinctly

unpleasant for one partner in the *Anglo-Italian Syndicate, Ltd.*, to contemplate the plight of the other.

Only the concentration of capitals and the systematic combination of industrial concerns and their connection with the big banks have enabled the British capitalists so successfully to encounter the manifold difficulties of the last year and a half. Farsighted were the old-established capitalists who sold out their plants, as did the owners of the *Lanarkshire Steel Co., Ltd.*, for £25 per £10 of shares, or the *Steel Company of Scotland, Ltd.*, for £35 per £10 of shares, at the top of the market. Happy were those expert and well served investors, chiefly banks, insurance and investment houses, and cautious manufacturing concerns, who bought debentures and left the *petit bourgeois*, the thrifty proletarians and the rag-tag-and-bobtail of the would-be *nouveaux riches* to buy ordinary shares in the innumerable companies whose lying prospectuses kept the printers working overtime in Britain and France throughout 1919 and 1920! Knowing ones were those directors of public companies, who bought British Government and Allied War Loan and laughed at the cranky I.L.P. politicians amusing themselves and their helpless auditors with schemes for bellng the tiger-cat of capitalism with a capital levy!

In this inevitable and progressively manifest shrinkage of capital values and of share prices, the advantage naturally belonged to those who were most experienced in the transaction of credit business and money changing, and who knew how, when and where to move their wealth, to anticipate the less expert company promoters and to checkmate the manœuvres of Governments and a Supreme Allied Council, pre-eminently reflecting the interests of the war profiteers and their type of capitalist imperialism.

During and after the War the cosmopolitan moneylenders, trading in the more abstract forms of money and with the most liquid assets, were regarded as German in sympathy and affiliations, and had against them in high places the tools of magnates, or the magnates themselves, who desired to use popular passions to weaken the political boycott, their quondam creditors. Latterly, however, the old-established financial oligarchy and their historic complement, the landed aristocracy promoted from the ranks of the *grande bourgeois* of the mercantile period of capitalism, have rallied their forces, and their ideas are to-day receiving publicity in the press and the earnest attention of premiers.

The money changers who assisted the governments of Counter-Revolutionary Europe at the time of and subsequent to the Napoleonic Wars; the merchant bankers of London and of Holland who waxed great upon the trade of the Baltic and the traffic of the Indies, lending their gains during the 19th century to promote the commercial and industrial development of Europe and the Americans; the Jewish moneylending houses of Frankfurt who acted as stewards and agents to the clerical and aristocratic owners of mineral estates and ironworks in Westphalia, and who, later, acquired immense wealth from their own business enterprises in the line of industrialism around Düsseldorf; these are the people who,

by one subterfuge or another, are intriguing and manœuvring to conserve and to enhance their financial pre-eminence in Europe.

The Rhine seems to act as a great magnet of money, and in the towns along its navigable reaches and, especially, about its mouths and those of its greater tributaries, are set clusters of money traders. Needless to say, political and religious liberty have had considerably to do with the attraction to Holland and to the formerly free towns of Protestant Germany of Jews driven out of Catholic countries. The victory of the *bourgeoisie* in France in the closing years of the 18th century, naturally drew numbers of them to Paris. It should be unnecessary to dilate upon the historic development of commercial economy and the peculiarities of racial custom and consequent environment which have led to the success of the Jews in the money trades.

V.

Hamburg via New York

BEFORE the War, when the United States was yet a debtor country and a field of investment for the surplus capital of Great Britain, Holland and Germany, it was evident that there was not complete solidarity on Wall Street. There were two great interests which had cooperated, competed, tried to cut each other's throat, and found it advisable to make the peace, but which, nevertheless, did not love each other overmuch. One was *J. P. Morgan and Co.*, and the other was *Kuhn, Loeb and Co.* There were others, but these were the great protagonists. The former was an agency for the import of British and Dutch capital and the export of American interest and dividends upon it. The latter was an agency for the same trade in German capital. The strength of the former capital enabled *J. P. Morgan and Co.* to become the monetary dictators of America, but these agents to His Britannic Majesty's Treasury were never "the 100 per cent. Americans" they claimed to be. Over against these negotiators for foreign capital was a *bonafide* "100 per cent. American" industrial group seeking the services of competing capitals. This was *Standard Oil*. It had dealings with Morgan, but, most of all, in the personal embodiment of *W. A. Harriman*, it employed *Kuhn, Loeb and Co.* to emancipate American railroads from the exclusive control of the British bondholder.

Kuhn, Loeb and Co. had great influence whilst the Democrats were in office. One of their partners, *Paul M. Warburg*, was selected by the Wilson Administration to preside over the Board of the *Federal Reserve Bank*, set up by Secretary *McAdoo* to weaken the Morgan influence and to bring American money under the control of "the American people." Since his retirement into private life once more, *Paul M. Warburg*, a cousin of the Warburgs in the *M. Warburg Bank* of Hamburg, has been made President of the *International Acceptance Bank*, a concern two-thirds American and one-third European, and including, on this side, *Hope and Co.*, *N. M. Rothschild and Sons* and their bankers, the *National Provincial and Union Bank of England, Ltd.*

L'Information (31/12/21) reports that there have been many kites flown in New York regarding a loan to Germany "since the visit of M. de Rothschild," and there follows as the next paragraph:—

"At the same time great interest is being taken in the news telegraphed from Berlin to the effect that an American should be put at the head of the Reichsbank. It is thought that M. Paul M. Warburg would be the man for that post, in view of his German origin, his very extensive experience of international finance and his capacity shown as head of the Council of the Federal Reserve."

Mark them—M. de Rothschild, Paul M. Warburg, C. E. ter Meulen; Rothschilds, Kuhn, Loeb and Co., Hope and Co.

The brother-in-law of Otto H. Kahn, of Kuhn, Loeb and Co., is Herr Felix Deutsch, head of the *Allgemeine Elektrizitäts Gesellschaft*.

What has happened is that the families who made money in Europe and invested it in America are now using their profits made in America to invest again in Europe. Here we have three financial dynasties taking the cream off the classic capitalism of Europe, then hastening to exploit the virgin resources of the New World and returning to profit out of "the coolie labour" of decadent civilisation in Europe. We see them using diplomacy and politics, the rivalries of states and the conflicts of parties and the antagonism of industrial and commercial interests to advance their dominion. But above all we see the International of Money Bags.

Besides the Warburgs and the Rothschilds, there are the Sterns, the Lazards, the Speyers, the Schroeders and the Kleinworts.

First, to take the *Sterns*. One of them, Sir A. G. Stern, was head of the Tank Corps in 1917. This specialist in street fighting is, apparently, the indispensable gentleman who is of Mr. Lloyd George's party at Cannes. He is a partner in *Stern Brothers*, a member of the London board of the *Imperial Ottoman Bank*, and a director of the *Bank of Roumania, Ltd.*, and is associated with the *Anglo-Persian Oil Co., Ltd.*, in Roumania. His other partner is a director of the *London Joint City and Midland Bank, Ltd.*

According to *L'Information* (30/12/21), the German banking house of *Jacob S. H. Stern*, of Frankfort,

"has international connexions, having ramifications in Paris and London."

E. Stern, of the Paris firm of *Stern Brothers*, is a director of the great *Banque de Paris et des Pays Bas* and the *Banque de l'Indo-Chine*. The former concern had two representatives at the Conference of Allied Experts at Paris, attended also by Sir R. M. Kindersley on behalf of the British bankers.

The *Lazards* are another shining light in the firmament of international exploitation. The parent house of *Lazard frères et Cie.*, of Paris, founded in 1854, has been very active of late in Central Europe. The London firm of *Lazard Brothers and Co., Ltd.*, is held as to 155,906 shares by the Paris house, and 155,906 shares by *S. Pearson and Son, Ltd.*, the contractors, and the Hon. Clive

Pearson. The New York house of *Lazard frères* is also controlled from Paris, but amongst the five partners only one has a name that sounds French. The others are: Blumenthal, Baerwald, Greenbaum and Altschul.

The Lazards are reputed to be in the same grouping as the Rothschilds, colour to which is lent by their alliance with the Pearsons, whose oil interests have been absorbed by the *Royal Dutch "Shell,"* and who have found employment for one of Mr. Lloyd George's sons.

Their chairman is Sir R. M. Kindersley, Governor of the *Bank of England*, chairman of the *Hudson Bay Company*, with whom Rathenau and other German industrialists have been deliberating, and who was present at the Allied Council of Financiers at Paris and has gone on to Cannes. Another director is Emile Pasch, a naturalised Russian, and director of the *International Russian Corporation, Ltd.*, and the *Anglo-Caucasian Oil Co., Ltd.*

A third director is the Hon. R. H. Brand, who represented the Ministry of Munitions at Washington in 1917-18, was financial adviser to Lord Robert Cecil as Chairman of the Supreme Council in 1919, and was the British Government's nominee to the Brussels Financial Conference called by the League of Nations in 1920, at which the ter Meulen credit scheme was propounded and adopted. He is brother-in-law of Lady Astor, M.P., that friend of Mrs. Snowden and J. H. Thomas, M.P.

Then there are *Speyer Brothers*, of London, whose senior partner has been degraded from his Privy Councillorship and lost his title quite recently. The New York house is *Speyer and Co.*, and very influential indeed upon Wall Street, and then there is the old firm of *Lazard-Speyer-Ellissen, of Frankfurt*, in which the head is E. Beit von Speyer of the Wernher Beit family on the Rand.

Another very old and powerful concern is that of *J. Henry Schröder and Co.*, whose senior partner, Baron Bruno Schröder, was naturalised in 1914 with more haste than dignity to avoid what the Home Secretary described as "a disaster," which would have occurred if he had not become British. The other partner is a gentleman called Tiarks, who is a director of the Bank of England and the Anglo-Persian Oil Co., Ltd. Schröders are heavily involved in the coffee trade, helped to form the Anglo-Danubian Association, Ltd., and are the London representatives of Speyer and Co. of New York.

We have already alluded to the *Kleinworts*, whose New York agents are the very influential firm of *Goldman, Sachs and Co.* These are the types of cosmopolitan financiers who, with the Goshens, Barings, Glyn Mills, Currie and Co., Ruffers and others, will probably do all in their relatively growing power to bring about a European financial *consortium*.

The Castiglionis have had their day. The company promoters and their clients, the speculative industrialists, have more to do making their books balance than considering how to invest their

profits. The traders in money, the credit merchants, having at their backs the mortgaged Governments of every land, are preparing to advance purchasing power to the customers, to give credit to those who are selling or hoping to sell; preparing to get a mortgage on the vendor and on the buyer; preparing to profit by trade, by manufacture, by finance; preparing to rake in the assets of industrialists, the good-will of merchants, the resources of states. Everywhere the peoples of the world are going into pawn. Everywhere the offensive is, for the present, with the International of Money Bags. It only needs a stucco frieze of Second and "Two and a Half" Internationalists in court dress to complete the Temple of a "True Democracy"!

Have You had Your Card?

Several of the most energetic branches have had their COMMUNIST REVIEW advertisement cards sent to them. But some branches have not ordered a card. Why? We do not know. These cards are beautifully designed and artistically coloured. There are several uses for them.

Get the COMMUNIST newsagent to display one in his shop. He will do this if you place an order for six COMMUNIST REVIEWS every month.

Take a card to every Communist meeting and place it in a prominent position. Be careful, of course, to take some REVIEWS with you. Get the speaker, or the chairman to draw attention to the card and the REVIEW. You then catch the audience leaving the hall. Don't be afraid to let them know that you have copies of the REVIEW for sale.

Send for a Card To-day

Book Reviews

Brilliant but Biassed

Agricola. A Study of Agriculture and Rustic Life in the Greco-Roman World from the viewpoint of Labour. By W. E. Heitland. 492 pp. Cloth cover. 47/6 net. Cambridge University Press.

THE above volume, by the author of the *Roman Republic*, is a solid piece of scholarly research work. It is a perfect mine of splendid data for the patient student of the Labour College movement. To many of those who have read superficial histories dealing with the glory of Greece and the greatness of Rome, and who have never peeped behind the scene of the brilliant Greco-Roman pageant that is set forth by certain historians, we strongly recommend a good dose of *Agricola*. Mr. Heitland has carefully examined all the records of the classical writers of the ancient world, and shows us the slave system in operation. He has devoted his attention solely to agriculture, because it, truly enough, was the most important industry of Greece and Rome.

An examination of the classical writers upon slavery, as quoted by Mr. Heitland, reveals many strange points. One cannot help observing that the enslaved masses of the Greco-Roman world were seldom noticed by the great intellectuals except during periods of social strife, revolts, or when the economic system had passed into its period of decadence. It is particularly when slavery becomes unprofitable that many of the philosophers and scholars get indignant about the inhuman treatment of the slaves. Our author does not draw specific attention to this fact; nevertheless, it is impressed upon one by a study of his book. To the alert Marxian there is more splendid material in *Agricola* than its author may know. And to the Communist propagandist a reading of the book shows the attitude of the propertied ruling class towards its workers during a period of rapid social decay which was greatly intensified by a policy of imperialism.

The economic collapse of Greco-Roman imperialism was accompanied by feverish attempts on the part of the ruling class to get their slaves to increase production, and many and varied were the plans adopted, but each and all proved futile. To analyse the schemes and plans adopted by the slave owners of Greece and Rome to aid production, at a time when the social fabric was riven by economic contradictions and class struggles, only serves to illustrate how old-fashioned are the increased production stunts of the modern Fords, Cadburys, and the other "humanistic" schemers. We find Varro, who defined a slave as an articulate tool, compelled to devote his attention to the need for stimulating agricultural production. He wrote at a period of internecine squabble, when the imperialist rulers of Rome had succeeded in exhausting the economic resources of the country, which resulted in a great deal of unsettlement and distress. Varro believed in the personal touch in industry. He was as full of ideas regarding

the scientific management of slaves as any modern industrial welfare enthusiast. Had he been alive to-day he certainly would have been engaged as a professor on human economics. His conception of social goodwill is outlined thus:—

“ For the overseers there should be rewards to make them keen in their work; care should be taken to allow them a private store and slave concubines to bear them children, a tie which steadies them and binds them more closely to the estate. It is these family ties that distinguish the slave-gangs from Epirus, and give them a high market-value. You should grant favours to overseers to gain their goodwill, and also to the more efficient of the common hands; with these it is also well to talk over that is to be undertaken, for it makes them think that their owner takes some account of them and does not utterly despise them. They can be given more interest in their work by more generous treatment in the way of food or clothing, or by a holiday or by leave to keep a beast of their own at grass on the estate, or other privileges; thus any who have been over-tasked may find some comfort and recover their ready goodwill towards their owner.” (p. 181.)

Old Varro knew the value of slaves and was able to estimate the true worth of the free-born wage-worker. Those Labour leaders who are continually pointing out the glorious development of the masses from chattel slavery into free labourers, should read what Varro thought of free wage-earners. Dealing with the risk of slaves being used in dangerous and unhealthy places, he says:—

“ I maintain that in the tillage of malarious lands it pays better to employ free wage-earners than slaves.” (p. 180.)

As our author points out, Varro recognised that slaves who had cost money and who had been reared and maintained at considerable expense were much too valuable to be exposed to dangers which could easily be undertaken by free wage-earners, who had no claim upon the responsibility of the employer. Mr. Heitland also contends:—

“ The great merit of the *mercennarius* is that, when his job is done and his wages paid, you have done with him and have no further responsibility. This brutally industrial view is closely connected with the legal atmosphere of Roman civilisation, in which Vasso lived and moved.” (p. 182.)

Our thousands of unemployed to-day may well envy the security of the slave; they may also think that the “ brutally industrial view ” of the Roman employing class is identical with that of the modern Christian, democratic, employers of imperial Britain!

Varro, of course, wrote his agricultural treatise on the management of landed estates for the propertied class. While he gives good advice on the value of kindness, as the best and easiest method of exploitation, he shows that where the human welfare idea does not work, the employer must resort to more drastic forms. So he informs the Roman Cadburyites, “ manage your slaves as men, if you can get them to obey you on those terms; if not—well, you must make them obey—flog them.” In these gentler and more

humanitarian days of Christian capitalist democracy flogging is not so feasible—besides, there are so many wage-slaves to flog—so compulsory unemployment and the scourge of starvation takes the place of the slave-owner's whip. But Varro, though a believer in flogging as a desperate remedy for rebellious Roman slaves, impresses upon the exploiters that "the master gets more out of his slaves when they work to gain privileges than when they work merely to escape punishment."

Although Varro lived at the beginning of the Christian era, and wrote his work on agriculture about 37-6 B.C., his ideas on scientific management were not in advance of the earlier Greeks, who also tried to increase production by feeding their slaves on the milk of human kindness. For example, Xenophon, writing in his *Economicus*, about four hundred years before Varro, says:—

But it is possible to make men more obedient by mere instruction, pointing out it is to their interest to obey; in dealing with slaves the system which is thought suitable for training beasts has much to recommend it as a way of teaching obedience. For, by meeting their appetites with special indulgence to their bellies you may contrive to get much out of them." (p. 57.)

Xenophon, it will be seen, was a firm believer in a C.I. population. The modern method of trying to enforce obedience upon producers by withholding food from their bellies, by enforced idleness, does not make for increased production, and results in a Z 44 population. Varro and Xenophon could see much further than Lloyd George, J. H. Thomas and the other champion upholders of democracy.

Although *Agricola* is a work of splendid scholarship, and as such we have nothing but praise for it, it is hopelessly marred by the author's class bias. The activity of the modern revolutionary proletariat seems to haunt Mr. Heitland. His work, as an historical investigation, naturally ends at the fall of the Roman Empire. The sub-title of the volume particularly emphasises that it is "*A study of Agriculture and Rustic life in the Greco-Roman World.*" The final and summing up chapter, instead of gracefully rounding off the discussion, abruptly and clumsily jumps over hundreds of centuries and lands the reader in—Soviet Russia! This is an unpardonable blunder. When Mr. Heitland begins to talk about Bolshevism and Marxism we are no longer listening to an erudite scholar. From that moment he is a bigoted and ignorant partisan who neither knows his subject nor understands what it is all about. We see here the melancholy spectacle of one who serves us with hundreds of carefully verified authorities when discussing some little historical happening in imperial Rome; yet in the same book who stupidly and arrogantly places on record his opinion of a modern world-wide revolutionary movement by referring us to Spargo's superficial volume on *Bolshevism*, which stands as a masterpiece of encyclopædic ignorance; and which for downright stupidity and venal villification comes second only to Madame Snowden's shameless libel on Russia. We see here the sad picture of one who tells us time and time again, when discussing the social collapse of

Greece and Rome, that none were so blind to the wrongs and misery of the slaves as the well-meaning scholars and philosophers of those times. We take but one example. Our author graphically shows the economic and military causes of the exhaustion of Italy; he shows that Tiberius did nothing to avert these dangers, and adds:—

“ that an Emperor, temperamentally prone to worry, did not foresee the coming debility and degradation of Italy, and fret over the prospect, is to me quite incredible.” (p. 163.)

Nevertheless, at that time Rome was very much sounder than capitalism is to-day; and even Mr. Heitland cannot see what is happening—not even when the Russian Revolution pulls his nose in an effort to make him observe facts which ought to be much plainer to him than were the portents of decadence in Italy at the period of Tiberius.

Just as in music one does not know the key of the piece until the last note has been struck, so in *Agricola* the final hysterical paragraph against Communism enables one to see throughout the whole book a subtle attempt to belittle Communism in every possible manner. We do not object to a healthy bias in any direction. In this connection we agree with a brilliant (anti-socialist) historian who frankly admits, in the preface to one of his books:—

Where I have considered it advisable to express my own opinion I have not professed that it should be impartial. A historian, whatever his opinion, should try to state *facts* accurately. But no one who is not idiotic can read and carefully consider masses of material on past events without forming a strong judgment, and if he expresses himself at all it is far more honest that he should express his own judgment as such than that he should pretend an impartiality which he cannot feel.

(*The Foundations of Society and of the Land*, p. 21. By J. W. Jewdwine).

The same author protests against the historians for beginning their volumes in the middle of an historical process instead of dipping into origins. He is pointedly critical, particularly with those historians who deal with land and labour because they are all afraid to trace the development of land-ownership back to communal or collective control. It is precisely this very thing that mars *Agricola*, and prevents it from taking its place as one of the most reliable pieces of historical investigation in the English language. Instead of boldly facing and accepting the verdict of history regarding the early collective control of land, Mr. Heitland hides himself behind a series of negative references. Thus, the book abounds with little sneering jabs at the “legendary” and “so-called” form of early communal control of land. In the break-up of the gens, side by side with the destruction of the old collective control of land, Mr. Heitland could have found plenty of splendid material for a good opening chapter to his otherwise valuable book. Such a chapter would have given his work a solid foundation.

Apart from the verified facts of history, regarding the communal control of land in ancient society, there is plenty of psychological evidence in the early period of Greece and Rome to

show that society had recently emerged from a system of crude communism. It is now an admitted principle of social psychology that in every economic crisis the spontaneous and emotional reaction of the most directly involved class tends to drive it towards an older form of society in its eagerness to find a solution for the problems pressing so heavily upon it. Hence we find that in many of the revolts of the propertyless masses in the early days of Greece and Rome a popular clamour was set up for a return to Communism. We have good reason to believe that in Athens there was a noisy, albeit incoherent, demand for Communism. One of the duties of the *impartial* historian is to obscure this disconcerting agitation when dealing with Athens. Nevertheless, it peeps through in most of the histories despite every attempt to smother it. Why did Aristophanes attack Communism? Why did Aristotle and many other distinguished Greeks find it necessary to denounce it? True, it may be admitted, such evidence looks only like smoke; but if there's smoke there must be a fire somewhere.

Despite the bias of Mr. Heitland there are hundreds of good things in his *Agricola*; once we know where his bias leads him to, we can always depend upon our Marxism to enable us to interpret the data, he has dug up, "from the viewpoint of Labour." Few proletarian students in these modern democratic days can afford 47/6 for a book, so industrial and history classes should see that a copy is purchased by local libraries.

W. P.

Superficial, Sentimental, Slop

A History of Labour. By Gilbert Stone. 415 pp. Cloth. 15/- net. Harrop.

THERE is a well known conception of history called the theory of progressive amelioration. It is hailed by all reactionaries, accepted by imperialists, and propagated by the sentimental leaders of the Labour Party. It sets out to show that the unfolding of history is but the development of the human race who began as a bunch of miserable chattels until it reaches slowly and painfully—very slowly and very painfully—the dizzy heights of a social system called parliamentary democracy, wherein capital and labour are brothers, clasping each other's hand, and where both are looking forward to the rising sun of Prosperity shining along the flower strewn path of reconciliation and social peace. In the Labour movement Mr. J. H. Thomas is one of its advocates. Mr. Philip Snowden's ringing eloquence upon the poet's theme of

"Where Freedom slowly broadens down
From precedent to precedent,"

shows that he also endorses the above theory.

It is a nice conception. It does away with class struggles. It repudiates revolution with as much nasty scorn as ever Mr. Ramsay MacDonald did. It believes in moral persuasion and recoils at the idea of Labour even dreaming of using Force. It has a smack of a Quaker's Sunday School blended with the anæmic teachings of the Workers' Educational Association. The theory has had many subtle advocates, some of them very clever and erudite, and some

of them as superficial and sloppy as the gentlemen enumerated above.

It was only natural to expect a book on progressive amelioration in these days when hungry and disgruntled proletarians are so desperate that they neither appreciate the progress (which keeps them waiting in a queue outside the Labour Exchange), nor the amelioration (which takes them to the Board of Guardians to crave a crumb for their starving children). We are indeed a thankless lot—even after all the thousands and thousands and thousands of years of progressive development towards that divine far off event. The author is Mr. Gilbert Stone, B.A., L.L.B. We are assured, or warned, that he was secretary to the coal industry commission. In the beautiful outside cover of the book we are informed:—

Mr. Stone has endeavoured to depict broadly the history of the masses, not only in England, but in other countries also, from the days when they were slaves to the *present, when they are free in the fullest meaning of the term.* . . .

Mr. Stone envisages a favourable solution of the problems of to-day, and his main purpose is to contribute to this by demonstrating that progress through the ages has been through reason and *not through force* " (italics ours).

Such a worthy, idealistic, work upon social pacificism should be welcomed by our I.L.P. Quakers in their attempt to conduct study classes. The above quotation is re-inforced by our learned author, who emphasises that to-day the masses " are free—and free not merely in the view of lawyers, but in truth." Again Mr. Stone informs us:—

" I am no believer in a suddenly achieved Utopia; I see little in history that suggests that short cuts are the best roads to travel by."

We believe Mr. Stone is perfectly sincere in this contention. Because the essential basis of the theory of progressive amelioration is that the right road must be long, very long, and the longer the better. But let him try to stimulate the enthusiasm of the South Wales miner, who is in debt to the mine owner after a week's work, in the unperceived beauties of the present system which has travelled via the long, long road so much admired by Mr. Stone. " Natural tendencies," we are solemnly assured, " favour evolution and oppose most sharply revolution." *Natural tendencies!* Does our M.A., L.L.B., not know that as a student of history he is, in reality, observing *social* tendencies? But let us proceed.

" When once the people had come into possession of political power (and that such a gain was secured is due primarily to the genius of three great countries, Great Britain, France and the United States) the upward movement was rapid."

We may be short-sighted, but we must confess that the only thing in the modern democratic days of which it might be truly said that "*the upward movement was rapid*" has been the cost of living.

As a true patriot Mr. Stone proves that Britain, France and the United States were the main countries to develop political institutions; he proves it in a regular patriotic manner—by merely *asserting* it. Dare we ask if Germany did not contribute anything? Our erudite authority shows a special weakness for Montesquieu. Can we trust the brilliant author of the "Spirit of the Laws"? Was he wrong when he said that the constitution of England was evolved in the backwoods of Germany? Are we overbold when we challenge Mr. Stone upon his reckless historical assertion that the English invented Parliament? Is the editor of *The Encyclopædia Britannica* (11th edition), Mr. Hugh Chisholm, wrong in tracing the germs of Parliament to those sections of the Teutonic and Anglo and Saxon tribes who finally settled in England? We cannot trace the English word "Parliament" in our language before the 13th century, but we know that the French had a *Parlement* then; at least, so says Prof. Esmein. The French borrowed the term from the Spaniards, who in turn took it from the Italians. Perhaps Mr. Stone is referring to the adventure of Simon de Montfort; he, however, as the name indicates, was a naturalised Frenchman. Before that time (1265), indeed, one hundred years before that, Parliaments composed of barons, prelates, and representatives from the cities met in Sicily and in Spain; there householders elected their members to what was called *Parlemente*. Parliament, as a *social* institution, was not invented by any particular *race*. It arose, as Adam Smith well observed, in all European States as the result, not of harmony and sweet reason, but in response to class antagonism; to the need for the kings to get support from the cities against the barons. Then, as to-day, Parliament was the political rallying centre of opposing economic interests prepared to back up their interests with force.

We cannot follow Mr. Stone in all his historical blunders. Indeed, so far we have not advanced beyond the *first* chapter—and there are sixteen of them. Despite his conception of history as a slow process, human life is too short and fleeting, and there are only sixty-four pages in the REVIEW. We must, perforce, economise space and time; thus we can only make two other quotations from the *History of Labour*. Our author says:—

For nearly all the years known to history man has been in that stage of political development which may be termed the era of kings.

He further states:—

"Our story commences with the slave, a status as old as human nature. . . ."

For Mr. Stone's theory of progressive amelioration it is necessary to show that mankind began in slavery and was despotically ruled by kings. Would it stagger Mr. Stone to be told that in the gentile form of society, during its classic period—which lasted almost seventy-five per cent. of the period of human society as we know it—that slavery was unknown and that kings had not been invented? Let our author spend some time studying the old clan system; let him probe into the *kinship* form of society which existed for

thousands of years before *political* society was born. There he will see an early form of government based upon blood-relationship, working the land in common without either king or slaves. There he will see private property slowly developing, and with it slavery, and with both, kings. And there he will see, when these have appeared, that human history does not *begin*, but rather that the first great period of human history had *ended*.

To-day the masses, in their desperate straits, are calling for food—the crowning apex of the slow development lauded by our author. To-day many of them are intellectually hungry and are calling aloud for mental food and all they receive is a Stone—M. A., L.L.B.!

W. P.

Are You Unemployed?

Then you ought to read the
“OUT OF WORK”

It is the official organ of the unemployed.
 It is published every fortnight and only
 costs one penny. 30 copies may be had for 2/-

Full particulars from:—

P. HAYE,
 Secretary, National Administrative
 Council of Unemployed,
 28, East Road,
 City Road,
 London, N.1

HAVE YOU READ

The Miners Conflict with the Mineowners

By JOHN THOMAS, the author of the above article?

Send for a copy

Price 8d.

COMMUNIST PARTY, 16, King Street, Covent Garden, London, W.C. 2



The Ninth Congress of All Russian Soviets

By SANTI DOVI

I.

Congress Assembles

THE opening of the Ninth Congress of the All-Russian Soviet on the evening of December 23, 1921, was enough to convince even the most sceptical that the New Economic Policy inaugurated last spring has not affected the revolutionary spirit of the Russian workers and peasants who seized power in November of 1917. The great Opera House was brilliantly illuminated and red banners blazoned forth from each of the mighty columns of the portico. Tickets were carefully scrutinised at the theatre-entrance, and twice again within the building; detachments of soldiers guarded every exit, and even on going out, tickets were re-examined, so that one felt again the old thrill of proletarian dictatorship, exercised openly and unconcealed. The same force that guards the sanctity of bourgeois parliaments is masked beneath a deceptive air of innocuous carelessness, as though every policeman were not reinforced by two plain clothes men. Here a state of acknowledged class-war still exists, and with it the need for an iron dictatorship. Though latterly the bourgeoisie have been permitted to raise their heads a little, here in the supreme governing body of Soviet Russia, the state of class-war is frankly recognised, and the triumph of the workers is maintained, as it was won, by force of arms.

Within, the great auditorium was illuminated from pit to gallery, and every seat was occupied. On the stage about five hundred people were crowded—the members of the Central Executive Committee, the specially invited guests and speakers of the evening, the Russian press representatives, and in front, before the footlights, was a long red-covered table reserved for the Presidium. In the pit sat the 1,400 odd delegates freshly sent up "from every part of Russia" to deliberate for the ten ensuing days upon the affairs of government, to elect a new Central Executive Committee to carry on until the next Congress, and then to return to disseminate the result of their activities in every nook and corner of the vast Republic. To one who has seen earlier assemblings of the Congress, little difference was to be observed, either in the aspect or in the sincere and

earnest enthusiasm of the delegates. Workers and peasants straight from factory and field, men and women a little graver, a little more determined than of yore, because more deeply inured to suffering and hardship of every description; their sheep-skin coats and caps and felt valinkis shabbier by another year of wear and tear; their faces thinned and hardened by privation, but wearing a new look of conscious power and self-confidence, unknown to the former Russian mujik. In the boxes and parterres and galleries sat the fortunate possessors of admission cards, including representatives from the various commissariats, from the trade unions, the Moscow Soviet and other institutions, while two boxes, the great one formerly occupied by the Czar, and the other once reserved for the Grand Dukes, were allotted to two widely-divergent, yet in the present crisis, to two equally significant delegations—to the Executive Committee of the Communist International and to the Corps Diplomatique of the countries which have recognised Russia, respectively.

At seven o'clock precisely, the Ninth Congress of the All-Russian Soviet was declared to be formally opened by the President of the Republic, Comrade Kalenin, and as the stalwart, grey-bearded peasant stepped forward, a shout rent the air, "Long live the Elder of the Russian Soviet Republic," followed by a resounding cheer which testified to the respect which Kalenin inspires in his fellow-workers. Nominations to the Presidium had been raining steadily upon the platform in the shape of tiny paper billets, and the list of nominees was read out and voted upon with clock-like unanimity. Comrades Lenin, Trotsky, Kalenin, Kameneff, Stallin, Zinovieff, Schliapnikov, Tomskey, Rudjutak, Bukharin, and a score of other less famous names, but of growing popularity among the workers, took their places at the long red table, with the exception of Lenin, who had not yet appeared. Then the orchestra crashed into the strains of the "Internationale," and the whole house, Diplomatic Corps included, rose to its feet as one man and did honour to the battle-song of the world proletariat, which has become at the same time, the National Anthem of the first Workingman's Republic. One other bit of sentiment was displayed before proceeding to the business on the agenda—"It is the first of our four years of existence as a Workers' Republic that we are at peace," said Comrade Kalenin, "and our victory has been purchased at the price of thousands of lives of our comrades. Let us stand a moment in memory of those who fought and shed their blood to save the revolution"—and again the whole house rose and paid tribute to the workers' cause, by doing reverence to those who had died to save it.

Printed copies of the agenda lay in every seat. It included such questions as the New Economic Policy, the electrification of Russian industries, the problem of transport and fuel, finance, the famine, the new trustification of industry, etc. Aside from the preliminary ceremonies of the opening session, the first day included a report by Lenin on the internal and external situation of Russia. His absence made it a little uncertain whether he would speak that evening; he had been too ill to attend the party conference which had just preceded the congress, and whose deliberations had served as a clearing-house for the policies and tactics to be pursued during the coming year. The report of Lenin to the congress of Soviets would

be at the same time an epitomising of the decisions of the party conference, and the Communist majority among the delegates to the congress would ensure the endorsement of these decisions. Thus smoothly worketh the wheels of the new proletarian democracy, sometimes called ergotocracy.

II.

Fraternal Greetings

THE first speaker of the evening was the honorary delegate from the Soviet Republic of Georgia, a martial figure with a ringing voice and the dashing beauty that characterises this singularly favoured race. He breathed welcome to the Ninth Congress with all the vigour of a war-trumpet, and his greetings to the sister Soviet Republic was like a call to arms. Only since they had rid themselves of the Mensheviki, he said, had Georgia been able to proceed to the solution of her pressing economic problems, and as for the boundary line between his country and Armenia, which had been the subject of so much heartburning and protracted negotiation between the respective diplomats of those two States, he had solved it with the President of the Armenian Soviet Republic while going to address a workers' meeting one day. Then came Comrade Soumbat, fraternal delegate from Azerbaijan, a true worker, clad in blouse and valinkis, speaking Russian badly, and when half-way through his speech, breaking into his native tongue, with apologies to the congress. He spoke vehemently, ardently, pacing up and down like a militant tiger, pawing the air with excitement as he described the battle fought and won by the workers and peasants of Azerbaijan, ending his speech with an impassioned "Dunyia Azad Hoi!" ("May the world be free!"), which brought a storm of applause from his hearers. Followed the delegate from the Soviet Republic of Armenia, speaking at first timidly, hesitatingly, in imperfect Russian, so that the attention wandered, until the inner force and intensity of the man overcame his agony of shyness, as he told of the struggle against the "Dashnaksakan," or Armenian Nationalists, which ended in the triumph of the workers. After Armenia rose up the Ukraine, in the person of Comrade Rakovsky, one of the most noteworthy figures in the revolutionary life of to-day. He narrated the story of the guerrilla warfare waged by the White Guards in that Russian Mexico, and the fiendish atrocities of Petlura, and how, despite them all, the steady co-operation of the mass of the peasantry had enabled this region, once known as the granary of Europe, to send to hungry Russia in the last year alone, 38,000,000 poods of grain. Then, last of the cordon of Soviet States that rings the southern and eastern boundaries of Russia, came the greetings from the prosperous peasants of far Eastern Republic, to the victorious workers and peasants of the R.S.F.S.R. In the name of his government, the representative proclaimed the intention of his people to oppose the march of imperialistic armies across their territories, should the coming spring witness another attempt on the peace and security of Soviet Russia.

It was an imposing panorama of revolution ceaselessly extending itself, as one after another, the new states which had won freedom as a result of the Russian revolution, rose up personified in their delegates and extended the hand of fellowship to the Mother-Republic of them all. The revolutionary wave that had started in the west, rolled ever eastward—Ukrania, Azerbaijan, Georgia, Armenia, Bokhara, Turkestan, Siberia, Mongolia—thus far the tide had risen, and some hidden magnet seems to impel it resistlessly forward, towards who can say what goal, the earth being round? The black-clad gentlemen in the box reserved for the Diplomatic Corps, who formed a part of the picture, yet who were so oddly at variance with it, must have wondered too, as they watched the scene with close attention, a little uneasy behind their well-bred savoir-faire.

Thus far, certainty. But now the prophets of revolutions yet to come stepped forth to greet the congress of All-Russian Soviets. Sen Katayama, the veteran Socialist of Imperialistic Japan, conveyed the greetings of his fellow-workers to the assembled delegates of the Russian workers and peasants, and proclaimed their desire to be at peace with Russia. There was a majestic symbolism in this voice from Japan's smothered working-class, in the very teeth of the advance of the Japanese army across the Siberian wastes, and the speech of Sen Katayama was greeted with roars of applause from the enthusiastic house that outdid itself to honour him. Then the representatives of the Communist Parties of the United States and Germany, in two eloquent speeches, testified to the fact that so long as the Russian Workers' Republic exists, the beacon-light of revolution flames for the world proletariat.

III.

Lenin's Speech

THEN came Lenin, with short, hurrying steps, his hands full of the notes of his speech, sweeping the auditorium to its feet as though precipitated by the same impulse that brought him to the tribune. A slow murmur of welcome and a quick patter of applause that burst into a hurricane of wild enthusiasm rolling in waves from orchestra to the topmost galleries, was the greeting that overwhelmed this little man who stood quietly waiting for the storm to pass and give him a chance to speak. Even were he unused to these frantic demonstrations of enthusiasm, one cannot imagine his betraying the least sign of self-consciousness or embarrassment, so detached is his manner of receiving such ovations, as though they were directed towards another person, and so manifestly sincere is his desire to proceed with the business in hand. It dies down little by little, and he raised his voice in the lull, but suddenly a frantic figure threw his sheepskin busby in air and shouted, "Long live Lenin, the leader of the world proletariat!" and the storm broke again. If genuine popularity, accompanied by deep faith and an abiding respect on the part of the masses, be the outer signs of greatness, then the other premiers of Europe, who pretend to dominate the world's stage, must doff

their plumes to Vladimir Ulyitch Lenin, to whose keen brain and unerring judgment and fathomless depth of common-sense the workers, not of one land only, but throughout the world of modern civilisation, look as their surest bulwark against the growing tide of black reaction.

Lenin's speech, of two hours' duration, was as homely as an old shoe, but it fit the situation with the same ease and grateful sense of wellbeing. He speaks with none of the magnificent rhetoric of Trotsky, nor with the fiery impetuosity of Zinoviev—he is neither impassioned, nor witty, nor eloquent. But he holds his audience more surely by another gift—the sublime ability of speaking profound truths in the simple language of a child, so that his hearers feel him to be expressing, not something new, but their own thoughts made lucid. There was little new in what he told, but there was a masterly survey and interpretation of events, both in and outside of Russia, so that the most unlettered working man and woman who might sit among the delegates or who would hear his speech next day could understand his own relation to these abstract problems of world-politics.

Slowly, slowly, said Lenin, out of the chaos of war and the relentless blockade which the foes of the Republic had drawn about her, a way out had been won and a balance struck, still quivering, still uncertain, but offering hope for future peace, recognition and trade. We need the world, but not more than the world needs us, and slowly, they are coming to a realisation of this fact. We have shown our enemies that we can compromise, that we know how to make concessions, but they must also know that there is an end, there is a limit beyond which we will not go. World capitalism is hurrying towards the abyss, and even in those countries which seem most secure, the process of destruction goes on. They are being forced to adopt the same conclusion which we arrived at four years ago, namely, the annulment of the war-debts. We have proven the possibility of existing as a Proletarian State, ringed about by capitalist enemies; now we must prove our ability to develop and control our own internal economy. On the military field we have won great victories. Let us be courageous enough to admit that on the economic field, up to now, we have failed. The new economic policy was justified because it was necessary. We must learn business from the bourgeoisie. "The greatest need of the present time," said Lenin, with earnest emphasis, opening and closing his right hand in a characteristic gesture, "is for economy and careful housekeeping on a national scale." We are entering upon a new period of our revolutionary development. We have not ceased to be revolutionaries, and we shall not cease to be, but the great need of the moment is for internal reconstruction. The most important problem of our revolution, and of all future social revolutions, is the relation between the proletariat and the peasantry. We must have something to give the peasant in exchange for his surplus crop, and until we can develop our own industries, we must get this something from outside.

Such are a few of the main pronouncements of the speech, selected at random as memory reproduces them. Clearer than words

stand out his gestures, and his manner of speaking, impressive in their extreme simplicity and earnestness, in the absence of all rhetoric and desire for effect. One feels that here speaks truth, and when he ceases there is nothing more to add. And what a world of strength and revolutionary purpose lies behind those calmly-balanced phrases! To those who have watched the aspect of Moscow change during the last eight months from a beleaguered citadel to a temple of money-changers, under stress of the New Economic Policy; to those whose minds had begun to doubt the outcome and the ultimate purpose behind it all, these words meant a world of reassurance and renewed faith. "We have shown our enemies that we know how to make concessions, but we shall also show them that we recognise a limit beyond which we shall not go." Despite the triumphant boastings of the bourgeois world, it is still the dauntless spirit of revolutionary Russia that dominates the Congress of All-Russian Soviets, and which exercises the ultimate authority, borne upon the invincible shoulders of the Russian workers and peasants, whose unshaken faith in their Communist leaders is manifested in the staunch support of the two mightiest organs of the working-class—the All-Russian Trade Unions and the Red Army.

(Moscow, Dec. 25, 1921.)

France

WITH the opening of the new year we find the Labour situation in France much clearer than it has been at any period since the Armistice. We must, however, be prepared for new changes, particularly in the construction of some of the organisations.

As was anticipated, the Congress of the French Communist Party, recently held at Marseilles, revealed many tendencies at work. Nevertheless the delegates endorsed the Theses laid down by the third World Congress of the Communist International. It remains to be seen how the new E.C. will interpret the decisions passed at Marseilles. The old Central Committee was certainly a trifle lax on several points, but this was mainly due to an endeavour not to enforce a too rigid discipline upon an organisation, only a few months old, and composed of many elements who were previously opposed to each other. The new E.C. know what the party is, and will be in a position to key up the organisation.

The old difference in viewpoint between Paris and the provinces made itself felt at the Congress. But the firm insistence upon an international fighting front will help to eliminate tendencies, almost inevitable under the circumstances, which arise from the intense cosmopolitan atmosphere of Paris as compared with the parochialism peculiar to country districts. Such differences find an outlet, in ways well known to students of mass movements, in personal dissensions. These, however, pale into nothingness as compared to the splendid work done during the past few months. The press of the French Communist Party is a formidable weapon.

As in Italy, so in France, the old Socialist Party veers ever more to the Right, and Longuet swings closer every day to traitors like Renaudel, just as Senati, in Italy, gets closer to types like Turati. The final outcome of all this can only end in an inglorious return to the Second International.

While Longuet and his companions are rapidly departing from the revolutionary position, there is no ambiguity regarding the prevailing tendencies among the industrially organised masses, who are becoming more and more imbued with the spirit of Moscow. Thus the most important event in the French trade-union movement was the organisation of a new Labour federation—the C.G.T.U. This marks the beginning of a new militant movement in France; it also marks the close of a long struggle between the Yellows and the Reds. The Reds did not desire to organise a new movement. They were compelled to do so by the dictatorial tactics of the "democratic" Jonheaux. Under his leadership the French trade union movement was dying; the militant adherents of the Red Trade Union International have been forced to recreate the industrial organisation of the masses—hence the founding of the C.G.T.U.

Help for Russia

Proletarians of all Countries! To the Aid of Russia!

WORKERS! In the entire world capitalism is going over to an imminent attack against you. The more the capitalist world decays, the higher the wave of unemployment and crisis rises, which, like an avalanche, rolls from country to country, the more impudently capital attacks your organisations, the louder it trumpets forth its strength and its power. Its chief heralds and troubadours, however, the ministers and presidents, the bankers and kings, are preparing a new war for humanity, and are working out new armament programmes. They want to plunge all the countries of the world in which will be a war more destructive, inhuman and horrible than its predecessor. It will leave no stone upon another, and will kill and cripple millions of human beings—workers and peasants, the productive population of city and country.

Comrades! All of you, without distinction of party, must realise this. You must all understand that the only guarantee for your victory is your own strength, *your own proletarian power*. Who at the present time holds in check the insanely foolish plans of the capitalists? Who fills them with terror and fear?

Your Soviet Russia! For every capitalist government fears the armed Russian workers. For every capitalist government understands that Soviet Russia is to-day the chief instrument, the *main weapon in the hands of the world proletariat*.

Imagine that Soviet Russia has fallen. Then the wave of bloody reaction would overwhelm the entire world. Capitalism would then stride in a triumphal march over the skulls of the working-class. It would consolidate its positions for long, long years.

THEREFORE HELP SOVIET RUSSIA.

Help its workers which have borne the brunt of the combined blows of the capitalist governments.

IN YOUR OWN INTERESTS HURRY TO THE ASSISTANCE OF THE FIRST SOVIET STATE.

The Russian workers have only now obtained the possibility of building up their economic life. Only now is production beginning to grow, are the chimneys of its factories beginning to smoke.

But the drought is clipping the wings of the Russian proletariat. In the rich Volga region the grain has been completely withered. Millions of human beings are dying under horrible tortures. Sickness and death by starvation are mowing down old and young, and little children are dying with the cry for assistance on their lips. The situation is serious. The misfortune is great.

PROLETARIANS, HURRY TO THE AID OF SOVIET RUSSIA!

A number of workers' organisations have already donated their mite for the Russian workers and peasants. The Communists have collected 100,000,000 marks. Other workers' organisations have also aided considerably. This assistance renders possible the feeding of about 50,000 persons.

HOWEVER, THAT IS NOT ENOUGH! HASTEN, FRIENDS OF THE WORKING-CLASS!

Especially you, workers of North and South America, Australia and South Africa. You have not yet gone through the bloody battle with capital. You have not yet been drawn into the final conflict. But the capitalist monster is already grasping you by the neck. It is already throwing millions of workers out of work. It is ready to deal you the final blow as well.

**HURRY TO THE ASSISTANCE OF YOUR CHIEF FORTRESS,
SOVIET RUSSIA!**

Help it to grow strong and to consolidate. It will return your aid one hundredfold. Together, in serried battle ranks, enter the struggle against the famine in Russia.

Long live the solidarity of the workers who will not sell their brothers in distress and misery!

Moscow, December 4, 1921.

The Executive Committee of the Communist International.

**Why are YOU not a member of
the Party?**

Colour's Only Skin Deep

[The triumph of the Russian masses in November, 1917, led by the dauntless Communist Party, was not only a standing provocation to the proletariat in all other countries—that triumph meant something more. The foreign policy of Soviet Russia and its attitude towards so-called inferior races and backward nations, in contrast to the bloody persecution of democratic capitalist States, has set up such an enthusiasm among the Yellow and Black races to extricate themselves from imperialist domination, that the imperial States are experiencing revolts in every part of the world. The Curzons, Churchills and Clemenceaus were more responsive to the far-reaching effects of the Bolshevik revolution than were the Macdonalds, Snowdens and Wallheads. We have stated, time after time, in the REVIGW, that neither Macdonald nor Snowden have, even yet, realised the full significance of the Soviet Republic as a driving force in the world revolution. While they, at their best, are nothing more than ignorant slanderers of the Russian Communists, the down-trodden Black and Yellow races see in the Soviet Republic the ONLY GOVERNMENT in the world that preaches and practices internationalism. While the *Labour Leader* turns its criticisms, of the pea-shooter variety against the Soviet Republic we find journals like the *American Crusader*, the organ of the free-aspiring negroes, publishing the following article in its editorial columns.—Editor, COMMUNIST REVIEW.]

Stand by Soviet Russia !

IN this number of "The Crusader" we present for the information of our readers a few of the many facts concerning Soviet Russia's friendly and fair-minded attitude towards the darker races and her concrete acts of friendship to them.

Of all the great powers Soviet Russia is the only power that deals fairly with weaker nations and peoples. She is the only power that has no skeleton of murderous subjugation and wrongdoing in her national closet—no spectre of a brutally oppressed Ireland or Haiti.

Soviet Russia, too, according to Lord Curzon and other British authorities, is the only great power that extends a helping hand to the oppressed peoples struggling for liberation. Curzon tells us she has given substantial aid to the Nationalist Patriots of India, Egypt and Turkey. If this is true—and Curzon thinks he knows—so much more glorious is Soviet Russia's record. The oppressed peoples of the world have all the more reason to be grateful to this strong and fearless champion of true self-determination and the rights of weaker peoples. But Soviet Russia, who in the past has treated the darker peoples so magnanimously and so boldly championed their rights against the land-hungry imperialist powers—Soviet Russia, the friend of the weak and oppressed, is now herself in need of help. Soviet Russia is in the throes of a terrible famine brought about chiefly by the brutal British blockade of her ports which made it impossible for her to import agricultural machinery, seeds, etc., etc. Soviet Russia needs your help to-day! Negroes! Workers! Comrades of all oppressed races and classes, **STAND BY SOVIET RUSSIA!** Strengthen Soviet Russia! Hold up the hands of Soviet Russia in order that Soviet Russia may be able to help you in the future as in the past!

Send your contributions to **THE FRIENDS OF SOVIET RUSSIA**, 201, West 13th Street, New York City. Don't delay. Delay may sacrifice the Revolution and the friend of the oppressed!

The Monthly Calendar

- 1921.
- Dec. 10 Dombal, Polish Communist leader and M.P., arrested.
- „ 12 Attilio Bolodari, Italian Socialist leader, murdered by Fascisti.
- „ 14 Plebiscite in Oedenburg (Burgenland) under a united Hungarian-British-Italian terror.
- „ 16 Anti-Communist persecutions in Japan, seven organisations suspended and many Communists arrested.
- „ 19-22 All-Russian Conference of the C.P. of Russia.
- „ 19-23 Sixth All-Ukrainian Soviet Congress.
- „ 20 Czech-Slovak-Austrian Treaty signed. This means a strengthening of the reactionary Little Entente.
- „ 20 Friesland, Brass and Maltzahn begin a right-wing movement in the C.P. of Germany.
- „ 22-24 The Unity Congress of the French Revolutionary T.U. Committee (C.S.R.), more than 1,500 unions represented.
- „ 23-28 The Ninth All-Russian Soviet Congress, 1,819 delegates present, of whom 1,690 are Communists.
- „ 25 Vladimir Korolenko, a famous Russian revolutionary poet, dies in Poltava, Ukraina.
- „ 25-29 The First Congress of the C.P. of France at Marseilles.
- „ 26 The Italo-Russian Commercial Treaty signed.
- „ 26 Berthelot, the Director of the French Foreign Office, resigns.
- „ 27 Decree *re* moratorium and restriction of exchange-transactions in Italy.
- „ 27 The All-Indian National Congress at Ahmedabad, Gandhi invested with dictatorial power.
- „ 29 The Banca Italiana di Sconto suspends payments.
- 1922.
- Jan. 1 The Revolutionary C.G.T. (General Federation of Labour) of France begins to function.
- „ 6 The Conference of Cannes decides to invite Russia to an All-European Conference.
- „ 7 The Dail approves the Anglo-Irish Treaty.
- „ 8 The Congress of the U.S.P.D. (Independent Socialist Party of Germany) opened at Leipzig.
- „ 12 Briand, the French Premier, resigns.